DUE DATE

Cl. No. ______ Acc. No. ______

Late Fine ... first 15 days.
Rs. 2.00 per day after 15 days of the due date.

London: C. J. CLAY AND SONS,
CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE,
AVE MARIA LANE.
Glasgow: 50, WELLINGTON STREET.

Leipzig: F. A. BROCKHAUS.
Bombay and Calcutta: MACMILLAN AND CO., Ltd.

THE

CAMBRIDGE MODERN HISTORY

PLANNED BY

THE LATE LORD ACTON LL.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF MODERN HISTORY

EDITED BY

A. W. WARD LITT.D.

G. W. PROTHERO LITT.D

STANLEY LEATHES M.A

VOLUME II

THE REFORMATION

CAMBRIDGE

AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1904

PREFACE.

IN accordance with the scheme of the *Cambridge Modern History*, this volume takes as its main subject a great movement, the Reformation, and follows this theme to a fitting close in its several divisions. No attempt is made to fix a single chronological limit for the whole range of European history. In international politics the battle of Marignano made an appropriate close to our first volume; the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis forms a still more conspicuous landmark for the conclusion of our second. The religious history of the Reformation period opens with the abortive Fifth Lateran Council, and Luther's Theses follow close. Some sort of religious settlement was reached in Germany by the Treaty of Augsburg, in England by the great measures of Elizabeth, for the Roman Church by the close of the Council of Trent; and the latter two events are nearly contemporaneous with the death of Calvin. Before his death Calvin had done his work, and the Reformed Church was securely established. On the other hand, the Religious Wars in France had just begun. Further developments of Lutheranism and Calvinism are left to be treated in subsequent volumes.

In this period the scene of principal interest shifts from Italy to Germany and Central Europe. Geneva, very nearly the geographical centre of civilised Europe at the time, becomes also the focus of its most potent religious thought, supported by her like-minded neighbours, Zurich, Strassburg, Basel, and the free imperial cities of southern Germany. As the scene shifts, the main stream of European life broadens out and embraces more distant countries, Scotland, Scandinavia, Poland. The Turkish danger, though still a grave preoccupation to the rulers of eastern Europe, had been checked; and limits had been set to the Ottoman advance.

The main proportions preserved in this volume will be found, it is hoped, to correspond with the relative importance of the several themes. If English topics are here treated on a relatively liberal scale, the Editors

cannot forget that this History in the first instance addresses itself to English readers, and they look for pardon if, upon the canvas of this work, Henry VIII, the Protector Somerset, Northumberland, Mary, and Elizabeth occupy more space than strict historical symmetry would demand.

The Editors have suffered many losses and disappointments. Chief among these is that of the chapter on the Council of Trent which Lord Acton had intended to write. No living historian could hope to bring to this task the wealth of accumulated knowledge that Lord Acton commanded, or his special opportunities of insight. The lamented death of Professor Kraus has prevented the chapter on Medicean Rome from receiving his final revision; and the loss of his bibliography is particularly to be regretted. Lapse of time and fresh engagements have disturbed many of the arrangements which Lord Acton had concluded. Of the nineteen chapters comprised in this work, nine have, however, been written by the authors to whom he assigned them.

In the original plan no provision had been made for the Reformation in Poland. This topic hardly seemed by its importance to deserve a separate chapter, and there were obvious reasons against including it in any of the others. On the other hand it could not be altogether neglected. A brief summary, compiled by one of the Editors, may serve to fill the gap.

Moved by representations which have reached them from many quarters, the Editors have added to this volume, as to Volume VII, a chronological table of leading events. A similar table for Volume I is now also supplied.

The thanks of the Editors are due to all the authors, who have spared no labour to perfect their several contributions, under conditions of time which were in many cases very burdensome.

A. W. W.
G. W. P.
S. L.

CAMBRIDGE, *November*, 1903.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

MEDICEAN ROME.

By the late Professor F. X. Kraus, of Freiburg i. B.

CHAPTER II.

HABSBURG AND VALOIS. (I.)

By Stanley Leathes, M.A., Fellow and late Lecturer of Trinity College.

CHAPTER III.

HABSBURG AND VALOIS. (II.)

By Stanley Leathes, M.A.

CHAPTER IV.

LUTHER.

By the Rev. T. M. Lindsay, D.D., Principal of the Glasgow College of the United Free Church of Scotland.

CHAPTER V.

NATIONAL OPPOSITION TO ROME IN GERMANY.

By A. F. Pollard, M.A., *Professor of Constitutional History in University College, London.*

CHAPTER VI.

SOCIAL REVOLUTION AND CATHOLIC REACTION IN GERMANY.

By A. F. Pollard, M.A.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CONFLICT OF CREEDS AND PARTIES IN GERMANY.

By A. F. POLLARD, M.A.

CHAPTER VIII.

RELIGIOUS WAR IN GERMANY.

By A. F. Pollard, M.A.

CHAPTER IX.

THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE

By A. A. Tilley, M.A., Fellow of King's College.

CHAPTER X.

THE HELVETIC REFORMATION.

By the Rev. J. P. Whitney, M.A., King's College, Principal of the Bishop's College, Lennoxville, Quebec.

CHAPTER XI.

CALVIN AND THE REFORMED CHURCH.

By the Rev. A. M. Fairbairn, D.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford.

CHAPTER XII.

THE CATHOLIC SOUTH.

By the Right Rev. W. E. Collins, D.D., Selwyn College, Bishop of Gibraltar.

CHAPTER XIII.

HENRY VIII.

By JAMES GAIRDNER, C.B., LL.D.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE REFORMATION UNDER EDWARD VI.

By A. F. Pollard, M.A.

CHAPTER XV.

PHILIP AND MARY.

By James Bass Mullinger, M.A., University Lecturer in History and Lecturer of St John's College.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE ANGLICAN SETTLEMENT AND THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

By F. W. Maitland, LL.D., Downing Professor of the Laws of England.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE SCANDINAVIAN NORTH.

By the Right Rev. W. E. Collins, D.D., Bishop of Gibraltar.

NOTE ON THE REFORMATION IN POLAND.

By STANLEY LEATHES, M.A.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE CHURCH AND REFORM.

By R. V. LAURENCE, M.A., Fellow and Assistant-Lecturer of Trinity College.

CHAPTER XIX.

TENDENCIES OF EUROPEAN THOUGHT IN THE AGE OF THE REFORMATION.

By the Rev. A. M. Fairbairn, D.D.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

CHAPTER I.

MEDICEAN ROME.

On the 18th of August, 1503, after a sudden and mysterious illness Alexander VI had departed this life—to the unspeakable joy of all Rome, as Guicciardini assures us. Crowds thronged to see the dead body of the man whose boundless ambition, whose perfidy, cruelty, and licentiousness coupled with shameless greed had infected and poisoned all the world. On this side the Alps the verdict of Luther's time and of the centuries which followed has confirmed the judgment of the Florentine historian without extenuation, and so far as Borgia himself was concerned doubtless this verdict is just. But to-day if we consider Alexander's pontificate objectively we can recognise its better sides. Let it pass as personal ambition that he should have been the first of all the Popes who definitely attempted to create a modern State from the conglomerate of the old *Stati pontificii*, and that he should have endeavoured, as he undeniably did, step by step to secularise that State and to distribute among his friends the remaining possessions of the Church. But in two ways his government shows undeniable progress: in the midst of constant tumult, during which without interruption tyranny succeeded to tyranny in the petty States, when for centuries neither life nor property had been secure, Cesare Borgia had established in the Romagna an ordered government, just and equal administration of the laws; provided suitable outlets for social forces, and brought back peace and security; and by laying out new streets, canals, and by other public works indicated the way to improve agriculture and increase manufacture. Guicciardini himself recognises all this and adds the important comment, that now the people saw how much better it was for the Italians to obey as a united people one powerful master, than to have a petty despot in every town, who must needs be a burden on the townsfolk without being able to protect and help them. And here Guicciardini touches the second point which marks the pontificate of Alexander VI, the appearance, still vague and confused, of the idea of a future union of the Italian States, and their independence of foreign rule and interference. Alexander played with this great political principle

though he did not remain faithful to it; to what could he have been faithful? Was not his very nature immoral and perfidious to its core? But now and then at least he made as if he would blazon on his banner the motto *Italia farà da se*; this brought him a popularity which nowadays it is hard to understand, and made it possible for him, the most unrighteous man in Italy, to gain the victory over the most righteous man of his time and to stifle Savonarola's reforming zeal among the ashes at the stake.

The idea of a great reformation of the Church in both head and members had arisen since the beginning of the thirteenth century, and was the less likely to fade from the mind of nations since complaints of the evils of Church government were growing daily more serious and well-grounded and one hope of improvement after another had been wrecked. No means of bringing about this reform was neglected; all had failed. Francis of Assisi had opposed to the growing materialism and worldliness of the Church the idea of renunciation and poverty. But Gregory IX had contrived to win over the Order founded by the Saint to the cause of the Papacy, and to set in the background the Founder's original purpose. Thrust into obscurity in the inner sanctuary of the Order, this purpose, tinged by a certain schismatic colouring, developed in the hands of the *Spirituales* into the *Ecclesia Spiritualis* as opposed to the *Ecclesia Carnalis*, which stood for the official Church. Traces of this thought are to be found in Dante; we may even call it the starting-point, whence he proceeds to contrast his *Monarchia* with the political Papacy of the fourteenth century, and as a pioneer to develop with keen penetration and energy the modern idea of the State. The opponents of the Popes of Avignon in reality only fought against their politics without paying any attention to the moral regeneration of Christendom. Theological science in the fifteenth century raised the standard of reform against the dependence of the Papacy, the triple Schism, and the disruption of the Church. But she too succumbed, her projects foiled, at the great ecclesiastical conferences of Constance and Basel. Asceticism, politics, theology had striven in vain; the close of the Middle Ages on both sides of the Alps was marked by outbursts of popular discontent and voices which from the heart of the nations cried for reform, prophesying the catastrophé of the sixteenth century. None of these voices was mightier than Savonarola's, or left a deeper echo. He was the contemporary and opponent of the men who were to give their name to this epoch in Rome's history.

The House of the Medici passes for the true and most characteristic exponent of the Renaissance movement. We cannot understand the nature and historical position of the Medicean Papacy without an attempt to explain the character and development of this movement. The discovery of man since Dante and Giotto, the discovery of Nature by the naturalism of Florence, the revival of classical studies, and

the reawakening of the antique in Art and Literature are its component parts; but its essence can only be grasped if we regard the Renaissance as the blossoming and unfolding of the mind of the Italian people. The early Renaissance was indeed the *Vita Nuova* of the nation. It is an error to believe that it was in opposition to the Church. Art and the artists of the thirteenth century recognised no such opposition. It is the Church who gives the artists employment and sets them their tasks. The circle of ideas in which they move is still entirely religious: the breach with the religious allegory and symbolism of the Middle Ages did not take place until the sixteenth century. In the fourteenth century the spread of naturalistic thought brought about a new conception of the beauty of the human body; this phase was in opposition to the monastic ideal, yet it had in it no essential antagonism to Christianity. It was a necessary stage of the development which was to lead from realism dominant for a time to a union of the idealist and realist standpoints. Many of the Popes were entirely in sympathy with this Renaissance; several of them opposed the pagan and materialistic degeneration of Humanism, but none of them accused the art of the Renaissance of being inimical to Christianity.

Its pagan and materialistic side, not content with restoring antique knowledge and culture to modern humanity, eagerly laid hold of the whole intellectual life of a heathen time, together with its ethical perceptions, its principles based on sensual pleasure and the joy of living; these it sought to bring to life again. This impulse was felt at the very beginning of the fifteenth century; since the middle of the century it had ventured forth even more boldly in Florence, Naples, Rome in the days of Reggio, Valla, Beccadelli, and despite many a repulse had even gained access to the steps of the Papal throne. A literature characterised by the *Facetiæ*, by Lorenzo Valla's *Voluptas* and Beccadelli's *Hermaphroditus* could not but shock respectable feeling. Florence was the headquarters of this school, and Lorenzo *il Magnifico* its chief supporter. Scenes that took place there in his day in the streets and squares, the extravagances of the youth of the city lost in sensuality, the writings and pictures offered to the public, would and must seem to earnest-minded Christians a sign of approaching dissolution. A reaction was both natural and justifiable. Giovanni Dominici had introduced it at the beginning of the century, and Fra Antonino of San Marco had supported it, while Archbishop of Florence, with the authority of his blameless life devoted to the service of his fellow-men. And so Cosimo's foundation became the centre and starting-point of a movement destined to attack his own House. At the head of that movement stood Fra Girolamo Savonarola. Grief over the degradation of the Church had driven him into a monastery and now it led him forth to the pulpits of San Marco and Santa Maria del Fiore. As a youth he had sung his dirge *De Ruina Ecclesiae* in a *canzone* since grown

famous; as a man he headed the battle against the immorality and worldliness of the Curia. He was by no means illiterate, but in the pagan and sensual tendency of humanist literature and in the voluptuous freedom of art he saw the source of evil, and in Lorenzo and his sons pernicious patrons of corruption. Zeal against the immorality of the time, the worldliness of prelates and preachers, made him overlook the lasting gains that the Renaissance and humanism brought to humanity. He had no sympathy with this development of culture from the fresh young life of his own people. He did not understand the Young Italy of his day; behind this luxuriant growth he could not see the good and fruitful germ, and here, as in the province of politics, he lost touch with the pulse of national life. His plan of a theocratic State governed only by Christ, its invisible Head, was based on momentary enthusiasm and therefore untenable. He was too deficient in æsthetic sense to be able to rise in inward freedom superior to discords. Like a dead man amongst the living, he left Italy to bear the clash of those contradictions which the great mind of Julius II sought, unhappily in vain, to fuse in one conciliatory scheme.

Such a scheme of conciliation meantime made its appearance in Florence, not without the co-operation and probably the encouragement of the Medici. It was connected with the introduction of Platonism, which since the time of the Council of Florence in 1438 was represented in that city by enthusiastic and learned men like Bessarion, and was zealously furthered by Cosimo, the *Pater Patriae*, in the Academy which he had founded. From the learned societies started for these purposes come the first attempts to bring not only Plato's philosophy but the whole of classical culture into a close and essential connexion with Christianity. Platonism seemed to them the link which joined Christianity with antiquity. Bessarion himself had taught the internal relationship of both principles, and Marsilio Ficino and Pico della Mirandola made the explanation of this theory the work of their lives. If both of them went too far in their youthful enthusiasm and mysticism, and conceived Christianity almost as a continuation of Attic philosophy, this was an extravagance which left untouched the sincerity of their own belief, and from which Marsilio, when he grew older, attempted to free himself. Giovanni and Giulio de' Medici, son and nephew of Lorenzo, were both Marsilio's pupils. Both were destined to wear the tiara and took a decided part in the scheme for conciliating these contrasts, which Julius II set forth by means of Raffaelle's brush.

The victory of the Borgia over the monk of San Marco was not likely to discourage the sceptic and materialistic tendency, whose worst features were incarnate in Alexander VI and Cesare Borgia. Pietro Pomponazzi furthered it by his notorious phrase, that a thing might be true in philosophy and yet false in theology; a formula that spread its poison far and wide. Even then in Florence a genius was developing,

that was to prove the true incarnation of the pagan Renaissance and modern realism. The flames which closed over Savonarola had early convinced Nicolo Machiavelli that no reform was to be looked for from Rome.

Savonarola's distrust of humanism and his harsh verdict on the extreme realism of contemporary art were not extinguished with his life. A few years later we find his thoughts worked out, or rather extended and distorted in literature. Castellesi (Adriano di Corneto), formerly secretary to Alexander VI and created Cardinal May 31, 1503, wrote his *De vera philosophia ex quattuor doctoribus Ecclesiae*, in direct opposition to the Renaissance and humanism. The author represents every scientific pursuit, indeed all human intellectual life, as useless for salvation, and even dangerous. Dialectics, astronomy, geometry, music, and poetry are but vainglorious folly. Aristotle has nothing to do with Paul, nor Plato with Peter; all philosophers are damned, their wisdom vain, since it recognised but a fragment of the truth and marred even this by misuse. They are the patriarchs of heresy; what are physics, ethics, logic compared with the Holy Scriptures, whose authority is greater than that of all human intellect?

The man who wrote these things, and at whose table Alexander VI contracted his last illness, was no ascetic and no monkish obscurantist. He was the Pope's confidant and quite at home in all those political intrigues which later under Leo X brought ruin upon him. His book can only be regarded as a blow aimed at Julius II, Alexander's old enemy, who now wore the tiara and was preparing to glorify his pontificate by the highest effort of which Christian art was capable. Providence had granted him for the execution of his plans three of the greatest minds the world of art has ever known: never had a monarch three such men as Bramante, Michelangelo, and Raffaelle at once under his sway. With their help Julius II resolved to carry out his ideas for the glory of his pontificate and the exaltation of the Church. What Cardinal Castellesi wanted was a downright rebellion against the Pope; if he, with his following of obscurantists, were acknowledged to be in the right, all the plans of the brilliant and energetic ruler would end in failure, or else be banned as worldly, and Julius II would lose the glory of having united the greatest and noblest achievement of art with the memory of his pontificate and the interests of Catholicism.

The Pope gave Cardinal Castellesi his answer by making the Vatican what it is. The alteration and enlargement of the palace however passes almost unnoticed in comparison with the rebuilding of the Basilica of St Peter's, on which the Pope was resolved since 1505. With the palace (1504) Bramante seemed to have set the crown on his many works; but the plans for the new cathedral, with all the sketches and alternatives which still survive and have been analysed for us with true critical appreciation, show us Bramante not only in the height of his creative

power, but as perhaps the most universal and gifted mind that ever used its mastery over architecture. The form of the Greek cross joined with the vast central cupola might be taken as a fitting symbol for Catholicism. The arms of the cross, stretched out to the four winds, tell us of the doctrine of universality; the classical forms preferred by the Latin race, the elevation with its horizontal lines accentuated throughout, bespeak that principle of rest and persistence, which is the true heritage of the Catholic south in contradistinction to the restless striving in search of a visionary ideal shown in the vertical principle of the north. St Peter's thus, in the development planned by Julius, presented the most perfect picture of the majestic extension of the Church; but the paintings and decorations of the palace typified the conception of Christianity, humanity led to Christ, the evolution and great destiny of His Church, and lastly the spiritual empire in which the Pope, along with the greatest thinkers of his time, beheld the goal of the Renaissance and the scheme of a new and glorious future, showing Christianity in its fullest realisation.

His own mausoleum gives proof how deeply Julius II was convinced that the chief part in this development fell to the Papacy in general, and to himself, Giuliano della Rovere, in particular. The instruction which he gave to Michelangelo to represent him as Moses can bear but one interpretation: that Julius set himself the mission of leading forth Israel (the Church) from its state of degradation and showing it—though he could not grant possession—the Promised Land at least from afar, that blessed land which consists in the enjoyment of the highest intellectual benefits, and the training and consecration of all faculties of man's mind to union with God. He bade Michelangelo depict on the roof of the Sistine Chapel (1508-9), how after the fall of our first parents mankind was led from afar towards this high goal; symbolising that shepherding of the soul to Christ, which Clement the Alexandrine had already seen and described. When we see the Sibyls placed among the Patriarchs and Prophets, we know what this meant in the language of the theologians and religious philosophers of that time. Not only Judaism, but also Græco-Roman paganism, is an antechamber to Christianity; and this antique culture gave not merely a negative, but also a positive preparation for Christ. For this reason it could not be considered as a contradiction of the Christian conception: there was a positive relationship between classical antiquity and Christianity.

And so at one stroke not only the artist, but the Pope, who doubtless planned and watched these compositions, took up that mediatory and conciliating attitude, which some decades earlier had been adopted in Florence by Marsilio and Pico. But we see this thought more clearly and far more wonderfully expressed in the *Camera della Segnatura* (1509). If we consider what place it was that Raffaelle was painting, and the character and individuality of the Pope, we cannot doubt

that in these compositions also we are concerned, not with the subjective inspiration of the artist who executed, but with the Pope's own well-considered and clearly formulated scheme. In the last few years it has been recognised that this scheme is entirely based on the ideas of the universe represented by the Florentine School. Especially it has been proved that the *School of Athens* is drawn after the model which Marsilio Ficino left of the *Accademia*, the ancient assembly of philosophers, while Parnassus has an echo of that *bella scuola* of the great poets of old times, whom Dante met in the Limbo of the Inferno. The four pictures of the *Camera della Segnatura* represent the aspirations of the soul of man in each of its faculties; the striving of all humanity towards God by means of aesthetic perception (*Parnassus*), the exercise of reason in philosophical enquiry and all scientific research (the *School of Athens*), order in Church and State (*Gift of Ecclesiastical and Secular Laws*), and finally theology. The whole may be summed up as a pictorial representation of Pico della Mirandola's celebrated phrase, "*philosophia veritatem quaerit, theologia invenit, religio possidet*"; and it corresponds with what Marsilio says in his *Academy of Noble Minds* when he characterises our life's work as an ascent to the angels and to God.

These compositions are the highest to which Christian art has attained, and the thoughts which they express are one of the greatest achievements of the Papacy. The principle elsewhere laid down is here reaffirmed: that the reception of the true Renaissance into the circle of ecclesiastical thought points to a widening of the limited medieval conception into universality, and indicates a transition to entire and actual Catholicity, like the great step taken by Paul, when he turned to the Gentiles and released the community from the limits of Judaistic teaching.

This expansion and elevation of the intellectual sphere is the most glorious achievement of Julius II and of the Papacy at the beginning of modern times. It must not only be remembered, but placed in the most prominent position, when history sums up this chapter in human development. Since Luther's time it has been the custom to consider the Papacy of the Renaissance almost exclusively as viewed by theologians who emphasised only moral defects in the representatives of this institution and the neglect of ecclesiastical reform. Certainly these are important considerations, and our further deductions will prove that we do not neglect them nor underestimate their immense significance for the life of the Church and Catholic unity. But from this standpoint we can never succeed in grasping the situation. Ranke in his *Weltgeschichte* could write the history of the first hundred years of the Roman Empire, without giving one word to all the scandalous tales that Suetonius records. The course of universal history and the importance of the Empire for the wide provinces of the Roman world were little influenced by them. Similarly, private faults of the Renaissance Popes were fateful for the

moral life of the Church, but the question of what the Papacy was and meant for these times, is not summed up or determined by them. It is the right of these Popes to be judged by the better and happier sides of their government; the historian who portrays them should not be less skilful than the great masters of the Renaissance, who in their portraits of the celebrities of their time contrived to bring out the sitter's best and most characteristic qualities. Luther was not touched in the least degree by the artistic development of his time; brought up amid the peasant life of Saxony and Thuringia he had no conception of the whole world that lay between Dante and Michelangelo, and could not see that the eminence of the Papacy consisted at that time in its leadership of Europe in the province of art. But to deny this now would be injustice to the past.

The Medici had not stood aloof from this evolution, which reached its highest point under Julius II. Search has been made for the bridge by means of which the ideas of Marsilio and his fellow thinkers were brought from Florence to Rome. But there is no real need to guess at definite personages. Hundreds of correspondents had long since made all Italy familiar with this school of thought. Among those who frequented the Court of Rome, Castiglione, Bibbiena, Sadoleto, Inghirami, and Beroaldus had been educated in the spirit of Marsilio. His old friend and correspondent Raffaelle Riario was now, as Cardinal of San Giorgio and the Pope's cousin, one of the most influential personages in the Vatican. But before all we must remember Giovanni de' Medici and his cousin Giulio, the future Popes. They were Marsilio's pupils, and after the banishment of their family he remained their friend and corresponded with them, regarding them as the true heirs of Lorenzo's spirit; Raffaelle has represented the older cousin Giovanni standing near Julius II in the *Bestowal of Spiritual Laws.*

It was a kingdom of intellectual unity, which the brush of the greatest of painters was commissioned to paint on the walls of the *Camera della Segnatura*; the same idea which Julius caused to be proclaimed in 1512, in the opening speech of Aegidius of Viterbo at the Lateran Council, referring to the classical proverb: "ἁπλοῦς ὁ μῦθος τῆς ἀληθείας ἔφυ—*simplex sermo veritatis.*" The world of the beautiful, of reason and science, of political and social order, had its place appointed in the kingdom of God upon earth. A limit was set to the neglect of secular efforts to explore nature and history, to the disregard of poetry and art, and its rights were granted to healthy human reason organised in the State; *Gratiae et Musae a Deo sunt atque ad Deum referendae*, as Marsilio had said.

The programme laid down by Julius II, had it been carried out, might have saved Italy and preserved the Catholic principle, when imperilled in the North. The task was to bring modern culture into harmony with Christianity, to unite the work of the Renaissance, so far

as it was really sound and progressive, with ecclesiastical practice and tradition into one harmonious whole. The recognition of the rights of intellectual activity, of the ideal creations of human fancy, and of the conception of the State, were the basis for this union. It remains to be shown why the attempt proved fruitless.

The reign of Julius II was one long struggle. The sword never left his grasp, which was more used to the handling of weapons than of Holy Writ. On the whole, the Pope might at the close of his pontificate be contented with the success of his politics. He had driven the French from Italy, and the retreat of Louis XII from Lombardy opened the gates of Florence once more to the Medici. The Council of Pisa, for which France had used her influence, had come to naught, and its remnant was scattered before the anger of the victorious Pontiff. And as he had freed Italy from the ascendancy of France so he now hoped to throw off that of Spain. It may be a legend that as he was dying he murmured "*Fuori i barbari*," but these words certainly were the expression of his political thought. But this second task was not within his power. On the 3rd of May, 1512, he had opened the Lateran Council to counteract that of Pisa. At first none of the great Powers was represented there; 15 Cardinals, 14 Patriarchs, 10 Archbishops, and 57 Bishops, all of them Italians, with a few heads of monastic Orders, formed this assembly, which was called the Fifth General Lateran Council. Neither Julius nor Leo was ever able to convince the world that this was an ecumenical assembly of Christendom. Julius died in the night of February 20–1, 1513. Guicciardini calls him a ruler unsurpassed in power and endurance, but violent and without moderation. Elsewhere he says that he had nothing of a priest but vesture and title. The dialogue, *Julius Exclusus*, attributed sometimes to Hutten, sometimes to Erasmus, and perhaps written by Fausto Andrelini, is the harshest condemnation of the Pope and his reign ("*O phreneticum, sed mundanum, ne mundanum quidem, sed Ethnicum, imo Ethnicis sceleratiorem: gloriaris te plurimum potuisse ad discindenda foedera, ad inflammanda bella, ad strages hominum excitandas*"). But at bottom the pamphlet is exceedingly one-sided and the outcome of French party-spirit. Although in many cases the author speaks the truth, and for instance even at that time (1513) unfortunately was able to put such words into the Pope's mouth as "*Nos Ecclesiam vocamus sacras aedes, sacerdotes, et praecipue Curiam Romanam, me imprimis, qui caput sum Ecclesiae*," yet this is more a common trait of the office than a characteristic of Julius II. It almost raises a smile to read in Pallavicino, that on his death-bed the magnanimity of Julius was only equalled by his piety, and that, although he had not possessed every priestly perfection—perhaps because of his natural inclinations, or because of the age, which had not yet been disciplined by the Council of Trent—yet his greatest mistake had been made

with the best intention and proved disastrous by a mere chance, when, as Head of the Church, and at the same time as a mighty Prince, he undertook a work that for these very reasons exceeded the means of his treasury—the building of St Peter's. We see that neither his enemies nor his apologists had the least idea wherein Julius' true greatness consisted. With such divided opinions it cannot surprise us that contemporaries and coming generations alike found it difficult to form a reasoned and final judgment of the pontificate which immediately followed.

Cardinal Giovanni de' Medici came forth from the conclave summoned on March 4, 1513, as Pope Leo X. Since Piero had been drowned on the 9th of December, 1503, Giovanni had become the head of the House of Medici. He was only 38 years of age at the election, to which he had had himself conveyed in a litter from Florence to Rome, suffering from fistula. The jest on his shortsightedness, "*multi caeci Cardinales creavere caecum decimum Leonem,*" by no means expressed public opinion, which rejoiced at his accession. The *Possesso*, which took place on April 11th, with the great procession to the Lateran, was the most brilliant spectacle of its kind that Christian Rome had ever witnessed. What was expected of Leo was proclaimed in the inscription which Agostino Chigi had attached to his house for the occasion:

> "*Olim habuit Cypris sua tempora, tempora Mavors*
> *Olim habuit, sua nunc tempora Pallas habet.*"

But other expectations were not wanting and a certain goldsmith gave voice to them in the line:

> "*Mars fuit; est Pallas; Cypria semper ero.*"

To Leo X the age owed its name. The *Saecla Leonis* have been called the *Saecla Aurea*, and his reign has been compared with that of Augustus. Erasmus, who saw him in Rome in 1507 and 1509, praises his kindness and humanity, his magnanimity and his learning, the indescribable charm of his speech, his love of peace and of the fine arts, which cause no sighs, no tears; he places him as high above all his predecessors as Peter's Chair is above all thrones in the world. Pallavicino says of Leo that he was well-known for his kindness of heart, learned in all sciences, and had passed his youth in the greatest innocence. That as Pope he let himself be blinded by appearances, which often confuse the good with the great, and chose rather the applause of the crowd than the prosperity of the nation, and thus was tempted to exercise too magnificent a generosity. Such expressions from one who is the unconditional apologist of all the Popes cannot make much impression, but it is noticeable that even Sarpi says: "Leo, noble by birth and education, brought many aptitudes to the Papacy, especially a remarkable knowledge of classical literature, humanity, kindness, the greatest liberality, an avowed intention of supporting artists and learned

man, who for many years had enjoyed no such favour in the Holy See. He would have made an ideal Pope had he added to these qualities some knowledge of the things of religion, and a little more inclination to piety, both of them things for which he cared little."

The favourable opinion entertained of Leo X by his contemporaries long held the field in history. His reign has been regarded as at once the zenith and cause of the greatest period of the Renaissance. His wide liberality, his unfeigned enthusiasm for the creations of genius, his unprejudiced taste for all that beautifies humanity, and his sympathy for all the culture of his time have been the theme of a traditional chorus of laudation. More recent criticism has recognised in the reign of Leo a period of incipient decline, and has traced that decline to the follies and frailties of the Pontiff.

With regard to the political methods of Leo some difference of opinion may still be entertained. Some have seen in him the single-minded and unscrupulous friend of Medicean Florence, prepared to sacrifice alike the interests of the Church and of the Papacy to the advancement of his family. To others he is the clear-sighted statesman, who, perceiving the future changes and difficulties of the Church, sought for the Papacy the firm support of a hereditary alliance.

Truth may lie midway between these two opinions. If we view Leo as a man, similar doubts encounter us. Paramount in his character were his gentleness and cheerfulness, his good-nature, his indulgence both for himself and others, his love of peace and hatred of war. But these amiable qualities were coupled with an insincerity and a love of tortuous ways which grew to be a second nature. Nor must we overlook the fact that Leo's policy of peace was a mere illusion; his hopes and intentions were quite frustrated by the actual course of affairs. On his personal character the great blot must rest that he passed his life in intellectual self-indulgence and took his pleasure in hunting and gaming, while the Teutonic North was bursting the bonds of reverence and authority which bound Europe to Rome. Even for the restoration of the rule of the Medici in Florence the Medicean Popes made only futile attempts. Cosimo I was the first to accomplish it. Leo had absorbed the culture of his time, but he did not possess the ability to look beyond that time. A diplomatist rather than a statesman, his creations were only the feats of a political virtuoso, who sacrificed the future in order to control the present.

Even the greatness of the Maecenas crumbles before recent criticism. The zenith of Renaissance culture falls in the age of Julius II. Ariosto's light verses, Bibbiena's prurient *La Calandria*, the paintings in the bath-room of the Vatican, the rejection of the Dante monument planned by Michelangelo, the misapplication of funds collected for the Crusade to purposes of mere dynastic interest, Leo's political double-dealing, which disordered all the affairs of Italy, and indeed of Christendom;

all this must shake our faith in him as protector of the good and beautiful in art. His portrait by Raffaelle, with its intelligent but cold and sinister face, may assist to destroy any illusions which we may have had about his personality.

The harshness and violence of Leo's greater predecessor, Julius, brought down on him the hatred of his contemporaries and won for his successor an immense popularity without further effort. The spiritual heir of Lorenzo *il Magnifico*, Rome and all Italy acclaimed Leo *pacis restauratorem, felicissimum litteratorum amatorem*; and Erasmus proclaimed to the world that "an age, worse than that of iron, was suddenly transformed into one of gold." And there can be no doubt that when Leo X was greeted on his accession, like Titus, as the *deliciae generis humani* he made every disposition to respond to these expectations and prove himself the most liberal of patrons. The Pope, however, did not long keep this resolution; his weakness of purpose, his inclination to luxury, enjoyment, and pleasures, soon quenched his sense of the gravity of life and all his higher perceptions; so that a swift and sad decline followed on the first promise.

On Leo's accession he found a number of great public buildings in progress which had been begun under his great predecessor but were still unfinished. Among them were the colossal palace planned by Bramante in the Via Giulia, St Peter's also begun by him, and his work of joining the Vatican with the Belvedere, besides the *loggie* and buildings in Loreto. Leo, who was not in the least affected by the passion of building—*il mal di pietra*—did not carry on these undertakings. He even hindered Michelangelo from finishing the tomb of Julius II, so little reverence had he for the memory of the Pope to whom he owed his own position. Only the *loggie* were finished, since they could not remain as Bramante had left them. Even after Bramante's death there was no lack of architects who could have finished St Peter's. Besides Raffaelle, who succeeded to his post as architect, Sangallo and Sansovino, Peruzzi and Giuliano Leno waited in vain for commissions. While Raffaelle in a letter relates that the Pope had set aside 60,000 ducats a year for the continuation of the building, and talked to Fra Giocondo about it every day, he might soon after have told how Leo went no further, but stopped at the good intention. As a matter of fact work almost entirely ceased because the money was not forthcoming. There is therefore no reason to reproach Raffaelle with the delay in building. On the contrary, by not pressing Leo to an energetic prosecution of the work, Raffaelle probably did the building the greatest service; since the Pope's mind was full of plans, for which Bramante's great ideas would have been entirely forsaken. No one could see more clearly than Raffaelle the harm which would have thus resulted.

(Leo X not only neglected the undertakings of his predecessor; he

created nothing new in the way of monumental buildings beyond the portico of the Navicella, and a few pieces of restoration in San Cosimato and St John Lateran. The work he had done beyond the walls in his villas and hunting lodges (in Magliana, at Palo, Montalto, and Montefiascone) served only the purposes of his pleasure. Of the more important palaces built in the city two fall to the account of his relatives Lorenzo and Giulio, that of the Lanti (Piazza de' Caprettari) and the beautiful Villa Madama on the Monte Mario, begun by Raffaelle, Giulio Romano, and Giovanni da Udine, but never finished. Cardinal Giulio de' Medici it was who carried on the building of the Sacristy in San Lorenzo at Florence, in which Michelangelo was to place the tombs of Giuliano and Lorenzo; but the façade which the Pope had planned for the church was never executed. Nor were any of the palaces built by dignitaries of the Church under Leo X of importance, with the exceptions of a part of the Palazzo Farnese and the Palazzo di Venezia. Even the palaces and dwelling-houses built by Andrea Sansovino, Sangallo, and Raffaelle will not bear comparison with the creations of the previous pontificate, nor with the later parts of the Palazzo Farnese at Caprarola.

Sculpture had flourished under Pius II in the days when Mino of Fiesole and Paolo Romano were in Rome; it could point to very honourable achievements under Alexander VI and Julius II (Andrea Sansovino's monuments of the Cardinals Basso and Sforza in Santa Maria del Popolo); but this art also declined under Leo X; for the work done by Andrea Sansovino in Loreto under his orders falls in the time of Clement VII, after whose death in 1534 the greater part of the plastic ornament of the Santa Casa was executed. The cardinals and prelates who died in Rome between 1513 and 1521 received only poor and insignificant monuments, and Leo's colossal statue in Ara Celi, the work of Domenico d'Amio, can only be called a soulless monstrosity.

Painting flourished more under this Pope, who certainly was a faithful patron and friend to Raffaelle. The protection he showed to this great master is and always will be Leo's best and noblest title to fame. But he allowed Leonardo to go to France, when after Bramante's death he might easily have won him, had he bestowed on him the post of *piombatore apostolico*, instead of giving it to his *maître de plaisirs*, the shallow-minded Fra Mariano (*sannio cucullatus*). He allowed Michelangelo to return to Florence, and, though he loaded Raffaelle with honours, it is a fact that he was five years behindhand with the payment of his salary as architect of St Peter's. A letter of Messer Baldassare Turini da Pescia turns on the ridiculous investiture of the jester Mariano with the *tonaca* of Bramante, performed by the Pope himself when Bramante was scarce cold in his grave. This leaves a most painful impression, and makes it very doubtful whether Leo ever took his patronage of the arts very seriously. In the same way his love of peace is shown in a very strange light during the latter half of his reign by the high-handed

campaign against the Duke of Urbino (1516); the menace to Ferrara (1519); the crafty enticing of Giampaolo Baglione, Lord of Perugia, to Rome and his murder despite the safe-conduct promised him; the war against Ludovico Freducci, Lord of Fermo; the annexation of the towns and fortresses in the province of Ancona; the attempt on the life of the Duke of Ferrara; the betrayal of Francis I and the league with Charles V in 1521. The senseless extravagance of the Court, the constant succession of very mundane festivals, hunting-parties, and other amusements, left Leo in continual embarrassment for money and led him into debt not only to all the bankers but to his own officials. They even drove him to unworthy extortion, such as followed on the conspiracy of Cardinal Petrucci and the pardon granted to his accomplices, or that which was his motive for the creation of thirty-one cardinals in a single day.

All this taken together brings us to the conclusion that Leo's one real merit was his patronage of Raffaelle. Despite the noble and generous way in which his reign began the Pope soon fell into an effeminate life of self-indulgence spent among players and buffoons, a life rich in undignified farce and offensive jests, but poor in every kind of positive achievement. The Pope laughed, hunted, and gambled; he enjoyed the papacy. Had he not said to his brother Giuliano on his accession: "*Godiamoci il papato poichè Dio ci l' ha dato?*" Though he himself has not been accused of sensual excesses the moral sense of the Pope could not be delicate when he found fit to amuse himself with indecent comedies like *La Calandria*, and on April 30, 1518, attended the wedding of Agostino Chigi with his concubine of many years' standing, himself placing the ring on the hand of the bride, already mother of a large family.

Nor can Leo's reign, apart from his own share in it, be regarded as the best period of the Renaissance. The great masters had done their best work before 1513. Bramante died at the beginning of Leo's pontificate, Michelangelo had painted the Sistine Chapel from 1508 to 1512, Leonardo the *Cena* in 1496, Raffaelle the *Stanza della Segnatura*, 1508–11. The later *Stanze* are far inferior to that masterpiece; the work of his pupils comes more to the fore in the execution of the paintings. And in his own work, as also in that of Michelangelo, the germ of decadence is already visible, and a slight tendency to *barocco* style is to be seen in both. The autumn wind is blowing, and the first leaves begin to fall.

The truth results that the zenith of Renaissance art falls in the time between 1496 and 1512, during which the *Last Supper*, the roof of the Sistine Chapel, and the *Stanza della Segnatura* were painted, and Bramante's plans for St Peter's were drawn up. We can even mark a narrower limit, and say that the four wall-paintings of the *Stanza della Segnatura* mark the point at which medieval and modern thought touch one another; the narrow medieval world ceases, the modern world stands

before us developed in all its fulness and freedom. One may indeed doubt whether all the meaning of this contrast was quite clear to the mind of Julius II; but after all that is a matter of secondary importance. For it is not the individual who decides in such matters; without being aware of it he is borne on by his time and must execute the task that history has laid upon him. Great men of all times are those who have understood the cry from the inmost heart of a whole nation or generation, and, consciously or unconsciously, have accomplished what the hour demanded.

It has been in like manner represented that literature passed through a golden age under Leo X; but considerable deductions must be made from the undiscriminating eulogies of earlier writers.

Erasmus has reflected in his letters the great impression made by Rome, the true seat and home of all Latin culture. Well might Cardinal Raffaelle Riario write to him: "Everyone who has a name in science throngs hither. Each has a fatherland of his own, but Rome is a common fatherland, a foster-mother, and a comforter to all men of learning." It is long since these words were written—far too long for the honour of Catholicism and of the Papacy. But at that time, under Julius II, they were really true. A circle of highly cultured cardinals and nobles, Riario, Grimani, Adriano di Corneto, Farnese, Giovanni de' Medici himself in his beautiful Palazzo Madama, his brother Giuliano *il Magnifico*, and his cousin Giulio, afterwards Clement VII, gathered poets and learned men about them, that *dotta compagnia* of which Ariosto spoke; to them they opened their libraries and collections. Clubs were formed which met at the houses of Angelo Colocci, Alberto Rio di Carpi, Goritz, or Savoja. The poets and pamphleteers, to whom Arsilli dedicated his poem *De Poetis Urbanis*, gave vent to their wit on Pasquino or on Sansovino's statue in Sant' Agostino. They met in the salons of the beautiful Imperia, in the banks described by Bandello, among them Beroaldo the younger, who sang the praises of that most celebrated of modern courtesans; Fedro Inghirami, the friend of Erasmus and Raffaelle; Colocci, and even the serious Sadoleto. It is characteristic of this time, which placed wit and beauty above morals, that when Imperia died at the age of twenty-six she received an honourable burial in the chapel of San Gregorio, and her epitaph praised the "*Cortisana Romana quae, digna tanto nomine, rarae inter homines formae specimen dedit.*" And although women no longer played so prominent a part at the papal Court as they had done under Innocent VIII and Alexander VI, yet, as Bibbiena wrote to Giuliano de' Medici, the arrival of noble ladies was extremely welcome as bringing with it something of a *corte de' donne*.

The activity of the greater number of literary men and wits, whose names have most contributed to the glory of Leo's pontificate, dates back to Giulio's time; so for instance Molza, Vida, Giovio, Valeriano, whose dialogue *De Infelicitate Litteratorum* tells of the fate of many of

his friends, Porzio, Cappella, Bembo, who as Latinist was the chief representative of the cult of Cicero, and as a writer in the vulgar tongue gave Italy her prose, and Sadoleto, who chronicled the discovery of the Laocoon group. Pontano too and Sannazaro, Fracastan and Navagero had already done their best work.

Nothing could be more unjust than to deny that Giovanni de' Medici himself had a highly cultured mind and an excellent knowledge of literature. It may be that Lorenzo had destined him for the Papacy from his birth; certainly he gave him the most liberal education. He gave him Poliziano, Marsilio, Pico della Mirandola, Johannes Argyropoulos, Gentile d'Arezzo for his teachers and constant companions, and, to teach him Greek, Demetrius Chalcondylas and Petrus Aegineta. Afterwards Bernardo di Dovizi (Bibbiena) was his best known tutor. In *belles lettres* Giovanni had made an attempt with Greek verses, none of which have survived. Of his Latin poems the only examples handed down to us are the hendecasyllables on the statue of Lucrezia and an elegant epigram, written during his pontificate, on the death of Celso Mellini, well known for his lawsuit in 1519 and his tragic death by drowning.

Nor can it be denied that the opening years of this pontificate were of great promise, and seemed to announce a fresh impetus, or, to speak more exactly, the successful continuation of what had long since begun. Amongst the men whom the young Pope gathered round him were many of excellent understanding and character, such as the Milanese Agostino Trivulzio, who later on was to do Clement signal service, Alessandro Cesarini, Andrea della Valle, Paolo Emilio Cesi, Baldassare Turini, Tommaso de Vio, Lorenzo Campeggi, the noble Ludovico di Canossa, from Verona, most of whom wore the cardinal's hat. Bembo and Sadoleto were the chief ornaments of his literary circle; to them was added the celebrated Greek John Lascaris, once under the protection of Bessarion, then of Lorenzo *il Magnifico* and Louis XII, in France the teacher of Budaeus, in Venice of Erasmus. Leo X on his accession at once summoned him to Rome, and on his account founded a school of Greek in the palace of the Cardinal of Sion on Monte Cavallo. Lascaris' pupil, Marcus Musurus, was also summoned from Venice in 1516 to assist in this school. At the same time the Pope commissioned Beroaldus to publish the newly-discovered writings of Tacitus. A measure, which might have proved of the utmost importance, was the foundation of the university of Rome by the Bull *Dum Suavissimos* of November 4, 1513. This was a revival and confirmation of an already existing Academy, in which under Alexander VI and Julius II able men such as Beroaldo the younger, Fedro, Casali, and Pio had taught, and to which now others were summoned, among them Agostino Nifo, Botticella, Cristoforo Aretino, Chalcondylas, Parrasio, and others. Vigerio and Tommaso de Vio (Cardinal of Gaeta) also lectured on

theology, and Giovanni Gozzadini on law. Petrus Sabinus, Antonio Fabro of Amiterno, and Raffaelle Brandolini are mentioned among the lecturers, and even a Professor of Hebrew, Agacius Guidocerius, was appointed. Cardinal Raffaelle Riario acted as Chancellor. The list of the professors given by Renazzi numbers 88: 11 in canon law, 20 in law, 15 in medicine, and 5 in philosophy. It was another merit of Leo's that he established a Greek printing-press, which printed several books in 1517 and 1518. Chigi had some years before set up a Greek press in his palace, from which came the first Greek book printed in Rome, a Pindar, in 1515. The Pope himself kept up his interest in Greek studies, and retained as custodian of his private library one of the best judges of the Greek idiom, Guarino di Favera, who published the first *Thesaurus linguae Graecae* in 1496, and whom he nominated Bishop of Novara.

Unfortunately these excellent beginnings were for the most part not carried on. It was not Leo's fault, but his misfortune, that many of the most gifted men he had summoned were soon removed by death. But we cannot acquit him of having ceded Lascaris like Leonardo to France in 1518, and allowed Bembo to return discontented to Padua; he did not secure Marcantonio Flaminio, and held Sadoleto at a distance for a very long time. The continual dearth of money in the papal treasury was no doubt the chief cause of this change of policy. Even before 1517 the salaries of the professors could not be paid, and their number had to be diminished. And this was the necessary consequence of Leo's ridiculous prodigality on his pleasures and his Court. Well might a Fra Mariano exclaim "*beviamo al babbo santo, che ogni altra cosa è burla.*" Serious and respectable men left him and a pack of "*pazzi, buffoni e simil sorta di piacevoli*" remained in the Pope's audience chambers, with whom he, the Pope himself, gamed and jested day after day "*cum risu et hilaritate.*" Such were the people that he now raised to honour and position; what money he had he spent for their carousals. No wonder that this vermin flattered his vanity and sounded his praises as "*Leo Deus noster.*" But beside this we must remember, that, as is universally admitted, Leo was extremely generous to the poor. The anonymous author of the *Vita Leonis X*, reprinted in Roscoe's *Life*, gives express evidence as to this, "*egentes pietate ac liberalitate est prosecutus,*" and adds that, according to accounts which are, however, not very well attested, he supported needy and deserving ecclesiastics of other nationalities. But he too remarks, that Leo's chief, if not his only, anxiety was to lead a pleasant and untroubled life; in consequence of which he spent his days at music and play, and left the business of government entirely in the hands of his cousin Giulio, who was better fitted for the task and an industrious worker. Unfortunately he admitted not only buffoons to his games of cards, but also corrupt men like Pietro Aretino, who is found living on the Pope's generosity in 1520, and in return extolled him as the

pattern of all pontiffs. The appointment of the German Jew Giammaria as Castellan and Count of Verruechio was even in Rome an unusual reward for skilled performance on the lute, and even for the third successor of Alexander VI it was venturesome to let the poet Querno, attired as Venus and supported by two Cupids, declaim verses to him at the Cosmalia in 1519. We have already mentioned the scandalous carnival of that year, and the theatre for which Raffaelle was forced to paint the scenery. A year later an unknown *savant*, under the mask of Pasquino, complained of the sad state of the sciences in Rome, of the exile of the Muses, and the starvation of professors and literary men.

From all this data the conclusion has been drawn that Leo X was by no means a Maecenas of the fine arts and sciences; that the high enthusiasm for them shown in his letters, as edited by Bembo and Sadoleto, betrays more of the thoughts of his clever secretary than his own ideas; and that his literary dilettantism was lacking in all artistic perception, and all delicate cultivation of taste. Leo has been thought to owe his undeserved fame to the circumstance that he was the son of Lorenzo, and that his accession seemed at the time destined to put an end to the sad confusions and wars of the last decades. Moreover, throughout the long pontificate of Clement VII, and equally under the pressure of the ecclesiastical reaction in the time of Paul IV, no allusion was allowed to the wrongdoing of this Leonine period; till at last the real circumstances were so far forgotten, that the fine flower of art and literature in the first twenty years of the sixteenth century was attributed to the Medicean Pope

But there are points to be noted on the other side. Even if we discount much of the praise which Poliziano lavishes on his pupil in deference to his father, we cannot question the conspicuous talent of Giovanni de' Medici, the exceptionally careful literary education which he had enjoyed, and his liberal and wise conduct during his cardinalship. We must also esteem it to his credit that as Pope he continued to be the friend of Raffaelle, and that in Rome and Italy at least he did not oppress freedom of conscience, nor sacrifice the free and noble character of the best of the Renaissance. Nor can it be overlooked that his pontificate made an excellent beginning, though certainly the decline soon set in, the Pontiff's good qualities became less apparent, his faults more conspicuous, and events proved that, as in so many other instances, the man's intrinsic merit was not great enough to bear his exaltation to the highest dignity of Christendom without injury to his personality.

Such a change in outward position, promotion to an absolute sway not inherited, intercourse with a host of flatterers and servants who idolised him (there were 2000 dependents at Leo's Court)—all this is almost certain to be fatal to the character of the man to whose lot it falls. Seldom does the possessor of the highest dignity find this enormous burden a source and means of spiritual illumination and

noral advancement. Mediocre natures soon develop an immovable bstinacy, the despair of any reasonable advisers, and which is none the nore tolerable for having received the varnish of a piety that vorships itself. Talented natures too easily fall victims to megalomania, nd by extravagant and ill-considered projects and undertakings drag heir age with them into an abyss of ruin. Weak and sensual natures ive themselves up to enjoyment, and consider the highest power merely s a licence to make merry. Leo was not a coarse voluptuary like Alexander VI, but he certainly was an intellectual Epicurean such as as seldom been known. Extremes should be avoided in forming judgment of the pontificate and character of this prince. Not the bjective historian, but the flattering politician, spoke in Erasmus when e lauded the three great benefits which Leo had conferred on humanity: he restoration of peace, of the sciences, and of the fear of God. It was groundless suspicion that overshot the mark, when Martin Luther ccused Leo of disbelief in the immortality of the soul; and John Bale 1574) spread abroad the supposed remark of the Pope to Bembo: "All ges can testifye enough, how profitable that fable of Christ has been o us and our compagnie." Hundreds of writers have copied this from Bale without verification. Much of Leo's character can be explained y the fact that he was a true son of the South, the personification of he soft Florentine temperament. This accounts for his childish joy in he highest honour of Christendom, "*Questo mi da piacere, che la mia iara!*" The words of the office which he was reading, when five days efore his death news was brought to him of the taking of Milan by his roops, may well serve as motto for this reign, lacking not sunshine and lory, but all serious success and all power: "*Ut sine timore de manu nimicorum nostrorum liberati serviamus illi.*" This pontificate truly vas, as Gregorovius has described it, a revelry of culture, which Ariosto ccompanied with a poetic *obbligato* in his many-coloured *Orlando*. This poem was in truth "the image of Italy revelling in sensual and ntellectual luxury, the ravishing, seductive, musical, and picturesque reation of decadence, just as Dante's poem had been the mirror of the nanly power of the nation."

On December 27, 1521, a Conclave assembled, which closed on anuary 9, 1522, by the election of the Bishop of Tortosa as Adrian VI. Ie was born at Utrecht in 1459 and when a professor in Louvain was hosen by the Emperor Maximilian to be tutor to his grandson Charles. Afterwards he was sent as ambassador to Ferdinand the Catholic, who estowed on him the Bishopric of Tortosa; Leo X made him Cardinal n 1517. This Conclave, attended by thirty-nine cardinals, offered a pectacle of the most disgraceful party struggles, but mustered enough nanimity to propose to the possible candidates a capitulation, by the erms of which the towns of the Papal States were divided amongst the

members of the Conclave, and hardly anything of the temporal power was left to the Pope. The Cardinals de' Medici and Cajetan (de Vio) rescued the assembly from this confusion of opinions and unruly passions by proposing an absent candidate. None of the factions had thought of Adrian Dedel; the astonished populace heaped scorn and epigrams on the Cardinals and their choice. Adrian, who was acting as Charles' vicegerent in Spain at the time of his election, could not take up his residence at Rome till August 29; it then looked, as Castiglione says, like a plundered abbey: the Curia was ruined and poverty-stricken, half their number had fled before the prevailing pestilence. The simple-minded old man had brought his aged housekeeper with him from the Netherlands; he was contented with few servants and spent but a ducat a day for maintenance. He would have preferred to live in some simple villa with a garden; in the Vatican among the remains of heathen antiquity he seemed to himself to be rather a successor of Constantine than of St Peter. His plan of action included the restoration of peace to Italy and Europe, a protective war against the invading Turks, the reform of the Curia and the Church, and the establishment of peace in the German Church. Not one of these tasks was he able to fulfil; he was destined only to show his good intentions.

We shall deal presently with his attempts at reformation, which have for all time made him worthy of admiration and his short pontificate memorable. He was not lacking in good intentions to make Rome once more the centre of intellectual life, but Reuchlin had lately died; Erasmus, to whom the Pope had written on December 1, 1522, preferred to remain in Germany; Sadoleto went to Carpentras; and Bembo, who thought Adrian's pontificate even more unfortunate than Leo's death, stayed quietly in northern Italy. Evidently no one had confidence in the permanency of a state of things which could not but appear abnormal to everybody. And indeed, the silent, pedantic Dutchman, with his cold nature, his ignorance of Italian, his handful of servants, "Flemings stupid as a stone," was the greatest possible contrast to everything that the refinement of Italian culture and the well-justified element of Latin grace and charm demanded of a prince. The Italians would have put up for a year or two at least with an austere and pious Pope, if his piety had been blended with something of poetry and grace; but this Dutch saint was utterly incomprehensible to them. And in truth this was not entirely their fault. As Girolamo Negri wrote, one really could apply to him Cicero's remark about Cato: "he behaves as if he had to do with Plato's Republic instead of the scum of the earth that Romulus collected." And it must have been unbearable for the Romans that the new Pope should have as little comprehension for all the great art of the Renaissance as for classical antiquity. He wanted to throw Pasquino into the Tiber because the jests pasted on the statue irritated him; at the sight of the Laocoon he turned away with the words, "These are heathen idols." He closed the Belvedere, and even a man like Negri

was seriously afraid that some day the Pope would follow the supposed example of Gregory, and have all the heathen statues broken and used as building stones for St Peter's.

In a word, despite the best intentions, despite clear insight, Adrian was not adequate to his task. The moment demanded a Pope who could reconcile and unite all the great and valuable elements of the Italian Renaissance, the ripened fruit of the modern thought sprung from Dante and Petrarch, with the conceptions and conscience of the Germanic world. Both the German professors who now posed as leaders of Christendom, Adrian Dedel and Martin Luther, were lacking in the historic and esthetic culture which would have enabled them to understand the value of Roman civilisation. Erasmus saw further than either of them, but the discriminating critic lacked the unselfish nobility of soul and the impulse which can only be given by a powerful religious excitement, an unswerving conviction, the firm faith in a personal mission confided by Providence. He too, despite his immense erudition, his deep insight, left the world to its own devices when it required a mediator; for a gentle and negative criticism of human folly is, taken by itself, of little value.

Adrian could neither gain the mastery over Luther's Reformation, nor succeed in reforming even the Roman Curia, to say nothing of the whole Church. The luxurious Cardinals went on with their pleasant life; when he came to die they demanded his money and treated him, as the Duke of Sessa expressed it, like a criminal on the rack. The threat of war between France and the German Empire lay all the while like an incubus on his pontificate. With heavy heart the most peace-loving of all the Popes, reminded by Francis I of the days of Philip the Fair, was at last obliged to enter into a treaty with England and Germany. Adrian survived to see war break out in Lombardy; he died on the day when the French crossed the Ticino, September 14, 1523. Giovio and Guicciardini relate that some wag wrote on the door of his physician, "To the deliverer of the Fatherland, from the senate and people of Rome." Little as the people were delighted with the pontificate of this last German Pope, he was no better pleased with it himself. He spoke of his throne as the chair of misery, and said in his first epitaph, that it was his greatest misfortune to have attained to power. The epitaph written for his tomb in Santa Maria dell' Anima by his faithful servant, the Datary and Cardinal Enckenvoert, was certainly the best motto for this man and his pontificate: "*Proh dolor! quantum refert in quae tempora vel optimi cuiusque virtus incidat.*"

A Conclave of thirty-three electors assembled on the 1st of October, 1523. Some sided with the Emperor, some with the French, but the imperial party was also divided. Pompeo Colonna made an enemy of the future Pope by opposing his candidature, and Cardinal Alessandro Farnese in vain offered the ambassadors of both sides 200.000 ducats.

Cardinal Wolsey once again made all kinds of offers, but there was now a feeling against all foreigners. During the night of the 18th–19th of November Giulio de' Medici was elected. He was the son of Giuliano, who fell in the Pazzi conspiracy. A certain Fioretta, daughter of Antonia, is mentioned as his mother; little or nothing was known in Florence about her and her child. Lorenzo took the orphan into his house and had him brought up with his sons. In 1494 Giulio, then sixteen years of age, followed them into exile. Living for some time in Lombardy, but mostly with Giovanni, on his cousin's rise in power he too was quickly promoted. Leo nominated him Archbishop of Florence, having specially dispensed him from the canonical hindrance of his illegitimate birth. At his very first creation of Cardinals on September 23, 1513, the Pope bestowed on him the title of Cardinal of Santa Maria in Dominica and made him Legate of Bologna, witnesses having first sworn to the virtual marriage of his father Giuliano with Fioretta. During Leo's reign, as we have already seen, Cardinal Giulio had almost all the business of government in his own hands. He secured the election of Adrian, but left Rome and the Pope on October 13, 1522, in the company of Manuel, the imperial envoy, in order to retire to Florence. A difference with Francesco Soderini brought him back in the following April to the Eternal City. He entered it with two thousand horse, and already greeted as the future Pope kept great state in his palace. A few days later Francesco Soderini, accused of high treason, disappeared into the Castle of St Angelo; he was released during the next Council. With the new reign a return of happier times was expected—*una Corte florida e un buon Pontefice;* the restoration of literature, fled before the barbarians; "*est enim Mediceae familiae decus favere Musis.*" And indeed many things seemed to point to a fortunate pontificate. The new Pope was respected and rich, and now of a staid and sober life. He had ruled Rome well in Leo's day, and as Archbishop of Florence had used his power successfully. He was cautious, economical, but not avaricious; though not an author himself, an admirer of art and science; a lover of beautiful buildings, as his Villa Madama gave proof, and free from his cousin's unfortunate liking for the company of worthless buffoons. He did not hunt, but he was fond of good instrumental music, and liked to amuse himself at table with the conversation of learned men.

Very soon it became clear that Clement VII was one of those men, who, though excellent in a subordinate position, prove unsatisfactory when placed at the head. The characters of both Medici Popes are wonderfully conceived in Raffaelle's portraits: in Leo's otherwise intellectual face there is a vulgarity that almost degenerates into coarseness and sensuality, and with Clement the cold soul, lacking all strong feeling, distrustful, never unfolding itself. "In spite of all his talents," said Francesco Vettori, "he brought the greatest misery on Rome and on

himself; he lost courage at once and let go the rudder." Guicciardini too complains of Giulio's faintheartedness, vacillation and indecision as the chief source of his misfortune. This indecision kept him wavering between the counsels of the two men, in whom from the beginning of his reign he placed his confidence; one belonging to the French faction, the other to that of the Emperor. One was like himself a bastard, Giammatteo Giberti, rightly valued by all his contemporaries for his piety, honesty, and insight. He took an active part in the foundation of the Order of the Theatines (1524) by the pious Gaetano da Thiene, afterwards canonised, in company with Caraffa. He was appointed Datary by Clement, and afterwards Bishop of Verona. Gasparo Contarini, writing in 1530, says that he was on more intimate terms with the Pope than were any of his other counsellors, and that in politics he worked in the French interest. He left the Court in 1527 to retire to his bishopric, which he made a model of good government. In Verona he founded a learned society and a Greek printing-press, which published good editions of the Fathers of the Church. Paul III summoned him to Rome several times; it was on his way back that he died in 1543. The Emperor's interests were represented* by Clement's other counsellor, Nikolaus von Schomberg, of Meissen, in Saxony. On the occasion of a journey to Italy in 1497, carried away by the preaching of Savonarola in Pisa, he had joined the same monastery. Later, scorned by the populace as a Judas, he had gone over to the party of the Medici, was summoned to Rome as Professor of Theology by Leo X, created Archbishop of Capua in 1520, and often entrusted with diplomatic missions, in which capacity Giulio came to know and value him. Contarini speaks well of him, but evidently only half trusted him. Schomberg received the Cardinal's hat from Paul III in 1534, and died in 1537.

Clement's accession had at once brought about a political change in favour of France. The Pope's policy wavered long between the King and the Emperor; weak towards both of them, undecided, and on occasion faithless enough. On January 5, 1525, he himself announced to the Emperor the conclusion of his treaty with Francis I. The Battle of Pavia, the greatest military event of the sixteenth century (February 24, 1525), made Charles V master of Italy and Francis I his prisoner. By April 1 Clement had made his peace with the Emperor, but soon began to intrigue and tried to form a league against him with Venice, Savoy, Ferrara, Scotland, Hungary, Portugal, and other States; this was mainly the work of Giberti. At this time the bold plan of a League of Freedom, which was to claim the independence of Italy from foreign Powers, was formed by Girolamo Morone; Pescara, the husband of Vittoria Colonna, the real victor at Pavia, was to stand at its head. The conspiracy in which Clement on his own confession (see his letter to Charles V of June 23, 1526) had taken part, was betrayed by Pescara himself: at his instigation Morone named the Pope as the

originator of the offers made to Pescara. The veil of secrecy still covers both Pescara's action—Guicciardini characterised it as *eterna infamia*—and his early death, which occurred on March 30, 1525. The Emperor freely expressed his opinion of the Pope's faithlessness (September 17, 1526). On May 22, 1526, Clement concluded the Holy League of Cognac with Francis, who had returned to France at the beginning of March, his captivity over. This brought on open war with the Emperor, the attack on Rome by the Colonna (September 20), the plundering of the Borgo, the march of the Imperial troops against Rome under the command of Bourbon, the storming of the part of the city named after Leo in which Bourbon fell (May 6, 1527), the flight of the Pope to the Castle of St Angelo, and finally the storming of Rome and the sack which followed it; cruel and revolting to all Christian feeling, it remains to this day a memory of terror for all Italians. No Guiscard appeared this time, as in the days of Gregory VII, to save the beleaguered Pope. On June 5, 1527, he was forced to capitulate, yield the fortress and give himself up to the mercy of the Emperor. When a prisoner and deprived of all his means, Clement bade Cellini melt down his tiara, a symbol of his own position; for the whole temporal power of the Papacy lay at the feet of the Emperor, who could abolish it if he chose. We know that this policy was suggested to him: we know also that Charles had serious thoughts of utilising the position of the Pope for an ecclesiastical reformation, and forcing him to summon the General Council, which all sides demanded. But France and England declared they would recognise no Council until the Pope was set free again, and the Spanish clergy also petitioned for the release of the Head of the Church. Once more the Imperial troops returned to Rome from their summer quarters, and in September, 1527, the city was once more sacked. Veyre arrived as the Emperor's agent to offer Clement freedom on condition of neutrality, a general peace, and the promotion of reform by means of a Council. The agreement was signed on November 26; but on December 8 the Pope escaped to Orvieto, whence on June 1, 1528, he removed to Viterbo. The war proved disastrous for France; Lautrec's defeats, his death by plague (August 15), the terrible state of Italy, which was now but one vast battlefield strewn with corpses, induced Clement at last to side with the Emperor. On October 8, 1528, he returned horror-stricken to half-burnt, starving Rome. Harried by the plague, her population diminished by one-half; her importance for the literary and artistic life of humanity had been for ever marred by the awful events of the year 1527. Those of her artists and learned men who had not fled were maltreated and robbed during the Sack: those that were left were beggars and had to seek their bread elsewhere. Erasmus wrote to Sadoleto (October 1, 1528) that not the city, but the world had perished, and that the present sufferings of Rome were more cruel than those brought on her by the Goths and the Gauls. From Carpentras in 1529 Sadoleto wrote

a mournful letter to Colocci, in which he speaks of past glories—a letter aptly called by Gregorovius the swan's song, the farewell to the cheerful world of humanist times.

Clement's participation in the league against Charles and the Empire had favoured the spread of the Lutheran Reformation in Germany. Unwittingly the Pope had become Luther's best ally at the very moment when for Catholicism everything depended on strengthening the Emperor's opposition to the Reformation, which had the hour in its favour. Even after the Sack the Pope was not chiefly concerned for the preservation and improvement of the Church, or for the reparation of the evil done to Rome. What absorbed his attention were the dynastic interests of his own House, which had once more been expelled from Florence, and the restoration of the Papal State. The Emperor could have ended the Temporal Power with a stroke of the pen had he not feared the immense influence of the clergy and the threatening voice of the Inquisition, which did not hesitate to cross the threshold even of the most mighty. Charles needed the Pope, since a lasting enmity with him would have cut the ground from under his feet both in Spain and Germany. He needed him in order to keep his hold on Italy, and by his influence to divide the League. And so the Treaty of Barcelona was brought about (June 29, 1529), whereby the Emperor acknowledged the power of Sforza in Milan, gave the Papal State back to the Pope, undertook to restore Florence to the Medici by force of arms, and as a pledge of friendship to give his illegitimate daughter Margaret to Alessandro de' Medici. The Imperial coronation was moreover to take place in Italy. The "Ladies' Peace" of Cambray (August 5, 1529) confirmed Spanish rule in Italy. Clement crowned Charles Emperor on February 24, 1530, in Bologna, having come thither with sixteen Cardinals. The Emperor left for the diet at Augsburg on June 15. The Pope returned to Rome on April 9; and on August 12 Florence fell after a heroic death-struggle, burying the honour of the Pope in its fall, since he had not hesitated to hand over the freedom of his native town to his family. The republican constitution of the town was formally annulled on April 27, 1532, and Alessandro de' Medici was proclaimed Duke of Florence.

Clement VII is said to have sighed during the siege: "Oh that Florence had never existed!" The Papacy itself, as well as its representative in that time, had good reason to utter this cry; for the fall of the Republic brought about by the Pope and accomplished by the Emperor and his bands of foreign mercenaries, joined the Papacy henceforth to all movements inimical to the freedom and unity of Italy. It delivered over Italy and the Church to the idea of an ecclesiastico-political despotism native to Spain; it severed the bond which in the Middle Ages had kept Rome in touch with the national aims of the Italian people. In December, 1532, Emperor and Pope met once more in Bologna in order to conclude an Italian league. At the same moment

Clement was negotiating with France, who did her utmost to draw the Papacy from the embrace of Spain. Francis I proposed the marriage of his second son Henry with Catharine, daughter of Lorenzo de' Medici the younger, and did his very best to help Clement to prevent an assemblage of the Council, as we now know from the disclosures of Antonio Soriano. The marriage of Catharine de' Medici, through whom her House attained to royal honour, was celebrated with great solemnity at Marseilles in October, 1533. Clement himself had come to witness the triumph of his family in the person of his great-niece. The young girl, scarcely more than a child, whom he handed over to the royal House of France, proved a terrible gift to the land; for some thirty-eight years later she contrived the Massacre of St Bartholomew. The jewels which Filippo Strozzi counted over to the French as forming part of the dowry of the little princess,—Genoa, Milan, Naples,—never came into the possession of France, and Henry was forced in the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis to yield all the gains of the French policy of annexation in Italy.

Clement was back in Rome by December 10, 1533, and in the following March annulled Thomas Cranmer's declaration that the marriage of Henry VIII with his sister-in-law Catharine of Aragon was void. The Pope threatened the King with excommunication if he did not re-establish the marriage. The King's answer was the separation of England from the obedience of Rome. Shortly before this the articles of the League of Schmalkalden had recorded the desertion of a considerable part of South Germany to the Reformation. The Council which was to have restored unity to the Church had not come into being. Clement certainly raised hopes of it in the near future at Bologna (January 10, 1533), but only for the sake of appearances. In reality he had every reason to prevent all discussion by a Council of his personal and dynastic policy, and he attained his end by excuses and means which led the Emperor's confessor, Cardinal Garcia de Loaysa (May, 1530), to write to Charles V that this Pope was the most mysterious of beings, that he knew more ciphers than anyone else on earth, and that he would not hear of a Council at any price.

Even the last act of the dying Pope leaves a painful impression. On September 23, 1534, he wrote a long letter to the Emperor, to recommend to his care, not the welfare of the Church or of Italy, but the preservation of the rule of the Medici in Florence, and the protection of his two beloved nephews, the Cardinal Ippolito and Alessandro, whom Clement had appointed to be his heirs.

After a painful illness Clement VII died on September 25, 1534. His friend Francesco Vettori gives testimony that for a century no better man had occupied Peter's Chair than Clement, who was neither cruel nor proud, neither venal, nor avaricious, nor luxurious. And despite of this, he continues, the catastrophe came in his time, while

others stained with crime lived and died happily. And indeed many an excellent quality seemed to promise this Medici a happier reign; but he had to atone for his dynastic egotism and for the sins of his predecessors. A fatal confusion of politics and religion bore its bitterest fruits in his pontificate. Rome was ruined, Italy from Milan to Naples was turned into a field of slaughter bathed in blood and tears; the unity of the Church was destroyed, and half Europe fell away from the centre of Christianity. All this was a painful commentary on the theories of political Catholicism and the esteem of that temporal sway over the world which some still affirm to be useful or even necessary to the cause of Christ.

The harmonious union of medieval with modern thought, the organic arrangement of the ideas brought by the Renaissance in the system of Christian Ethics, the inner development of Catholicism on the basis of this harmony as planned in the scheme of the *Camera della Segnatura;* all this miscarried, and was bound to do so, since the acting powers, on whom devolved the accomplishment of this great scheme, conceived in the true spirit of the Apostle Paul, lacked the ability and enthusiasm necessary for the execution of so enormous a task. The preceding paragraphs have shown to what extent these acting powers were incapable of fulfilling the mission set before them.

The powers at work were two in chief, the Papacy and the Italian nation. We have seen the Papacy of Medicean Rome swayed by political, by worldly considerations, guided in all its actions and decisions by the dynastic interests of its rulers. The religious and moral point of view was ignored in this domain of worldly aims and ideas The pontificate of Adrian VI, that came as an interlude between those of Leo X and Clement VII, certainly was representative of religious Catholicism,—honourable, wise, sincere. But on the one hand it was of too short a duration to ripen any of its fruits, and on the other it failed, not only because of Italian corruption and the general dislike to foreigners, but also because the last Teutonic Pope could not comprehend the development of Italian culture, the right of the Latin world to its own characteristics, and the aesthetic interests swaying all minds south of the Alps. The predominance of the worldly and sensuous elements in life, in science, and even in art came into play; they did their part in preventing the victory of idealistic views.

Although the Curia was not equal to its task, had Italy been still in a healthy state the nation and public opinion could have forced the Papacy into right courses. But here also corruption had long since set in. Strong moral force, such as proclaims itself in Dante, in Caterina of Siena, was gone from the people; they had but lately given its last prophet to the flames in the Piazza della Signoria at Florence. No nation can sin thus against its best men without punishment. The

people of Italy could not put new blood and fresh life into the Curia, because in them the law of the body had triumphed over the law of the spirit. The same observation has to be made in the province of literature. We have spoken of Ariosto; the other productions of the Medicean period in the domain of literature are for the most part trifling and frivolous in their contents. As Gregorovius says, their poets sang the praises of Maecenas and Phryne, they wrote pastorals and epics of chivalry, while the freedom of Italy perished. The theatre, still more early and markedly than pictorial art, cut itself adrift from ecclesiastical subjects and from the whole world of religious ideas. It became not merely worldly, but distinctly pagan, and at the same time incapable of any great creation of lasting value which could touch the heart of the nation. Serious theological literature was almost entirely lacking at Leo's Court and during his pontificate, with the exception of two or three names, such as Sadoleto, Egidio of Viterbo, and Tommaso de Vio. After the death of Raffaelle and Leonardo painting and sculpture at once took a downward path. Michelangelo upheld for himself the great traditions of the best time of the Renaissance for almost another quarter of a century; but he was soon a very lonely man. Decadence showed itself directly after Raffaelle's death, when Marcantonio engraved Giulio Romano's indecent pictures, and Pietro Aretino wrote a commentary on them of still more indecent sonnets. Clement VII, who had at one time received this most worthless of all men of letters as a guest in his Villa Careggi, repulsed him after this. But Aretino was characteristic of his time; what other would have borne with him?

After Raffaelle's death ideas were no longer made the subject of paintings; the world of enjoyment, sweet, earthly, sensual enjoyment, was now depicted before art declined into a chilly mannerism and the composite falseness of eclecticism. A time which is no longer able to give an artistic rendering of ideas is incapable of resolution and of great actions. Not only the Muses and the Graces wept by Raffaelle's grave, the whole Julian epoch was buried with him. During Leo's reign he had undertaken with feverish activity to conjure up not only ancient Rome but the antique ideals. In vain. His unaided force was not enough for the task, and he saw himself deserted by those whom he most needed and on whom he relied. And then came the Sack of Rome; it was the tomb of all this ideal world of the Renaissance period. From the smoking ruins of the Eternal City rose a dense, grey fog, a gloomy, spiritless despotism, utterly out of touch with the joyous spring of the mind of the Italian people whose harbinger was Dante. Under its oppression the intellectual life of the nation soon sank asphyxiated.

The Guelf movement of the Middle Ages, which had its home in the free States of Tuscany and North Italy, was dead and gone; it could no longer give life or withhold it. And the old Ghibelline

principle was dead too. No German Emperor arose in whom the dreams of Henry VII could live again. What Charles V sought and attained in the two conferences at Bologna and during his subsequent visit to Rome (April 5, 1536) had nothing whatever to do with the plans of the Emperors before him. The restoration of the Medici in Florence and the Emperor's dealings with the doomed Republic inaugurated that unhappy policy which down to 1866 continued to make the Germans enemies of the Italians. This it was that, after the tribulations of Metternich's government, brought on the catastrophe of Solferino and Sadowa.

The programme of 1510 demanded in the first place a reformation of the Church, both in its head and its members. Let us consider the attitude of Rome under the Medici with regard to this question.

The reformations attempted by the Councils of Constance and Basel had utterly failed. Since Martin V had returned to Rome the Papacy could consider nothing beyond the governing of the Papal State, and since Calixtus III it was involved in dynastic intrigue. Æneas Silvius had stated with the utmost clearness thirteen years before he became Pope that no one in the Curia any longer thought of reformation. Then Savonarola appeared; France and Germany cried out for reform. At the synods of Orleans and Tours (1510) the French decided on the assembling of an Ecumenical Council. In view of the decree *Frequens* of the Council of Constance, the dilatoriness of the Pope, and the breaking of the oath he had sworn in conclave, the Second Synod of Pisa was convoked (May 16, 1511). It was first and foremost a check offered to Julius II by French politicians, but was also intended to obtain a general recognition by the Church of the principles of the Pragmatic Sanction of 1438 drawn from the articles of the Basel and Constance conventions. This pseudo-synod was attended only by a few French prelates and savants. Meantime the Emperor Maximilian had conferred with the leading theologians of his Empire, such as Geiler von Kaisersberg, Wimpheling, Trithemius, Johann Eck, Matthäus Lang, and Conrad Peutinger, about the state of the Church. In 1510 he commissioned the Schlettstadt professor, Jakob Wimpheling, to draw up a plan of reform, which the latter published in his *Gravamina Germanicae Nationis cum remediis et avisamentis ad Caesaream Maiestatem.* It is composed of an extract from the Pragmatic Sanction, an essay on the machinations of courtiers, another on the ten grievances, with their remedies, notifications for the Emperor, and an excursus concerning legates. The ten *gravamina* are the same which Martin Mayr had mentioned as early as 1457 in his epistle to Æneas Silvius.

The Emperor, who since 1507 cherished the wild plan of procuring his own election to the Papacy on the death of Julius, at first gave his protection to the Council of Pisa. Afterwards he withdrew it, and

the German Bishops also refused to have anything to do with the schismatic tendencies of the French. On July 18, 1511, Julius II summoned an Ecumenical Council to Rome; it assembled there on April 19, 1512, with a very small attendance composed entirely of Italian prelates. The Spaniards also showed an interest in the work of reformation, as is proved by the noteworthy anonymous *Brevis Memoria*, published by Döllinger; but they took no part in the Council. Before the opening of the *Lateranense V* a controversy had arisen on the powers within the scope of Councils. The Milanese jurist Decius had upheld the side of the Pisan Council, so had the anonymous author of the *Status Romani Imperii*, published in Nardouin, and Zaccaria Ferreni of Vicenza; the chief disputant on the side of the Curia was Tommaso de Vio (Cajetan).

It was a good omen for the Council that the best and most pious man of intellect then in Rome made the opening speech. Aegidius of Viterbo as Principal of the Augustinian Order had worked energetically at the reform of his own Order ever since 1508. Bembo and Sadoleto praised his intellect and his learning, and the latter wrote to the former that, though humanity and the *artes humanitatis* had been lost to mankind, yet Aegidius alone and unaided could have restored them to us. In his opening speech Aegidius uttered some earnest truths and deep thoughts. He touched on the real source of decadence in the Church, when, perhaps in allusion to Dante's words about the donation of Constantine, he said, "*Ita ferme post Constantini tempora, quae ut sacris in rebus multum adiecere splendoris et ornamenti, ita morum et vitae severitatem non parum enervarunt; quoties a Synodis habendis cessatum est, toties vidimus sponsam a sponso derelictam.*"

Unfortunately the Council did not fulfil the expectations which might have been based on this inaugural address. When Leo X opened the sixth sitting (April 27, 1513) the assembly numbered, besides 22 cardinals and 91 abbots, only 62 bishops. Bishop Simon, of Modena, appealed to the prelates to begin by reforming themselves. At the seventh sitting the preacher, Rio, revived the theory of the two swords. On December 19, 1513, France was officially represented, and at the eighth sitting the Council condemned the heresies taken from the Arabs concerning the human soul, which was explained as *humani corporis forma*. These had already been denounced at Vienne. Then the theologians were called on to prune "the infected roots of philosophy and poetry." Philosophers were to uphold the truth of Christianity. Bishop Nicholas of Bergamo and Cardinal Cajetan opposed this measure; the first did not wish restrictions to be imposed on philosophers and theologians, the second did not agree that philosophers should be called upon to uphold the truth of the Faith, since in this way a confusion might arise between theology and philosophy, which would damage the freedom of philosophy. At the ninth sitting the curialist, Antonio Pucci, spoke on reform, and

said that the clergy had fallen away from love; that the tyranny of inordinate desire had taken its place; that their lives were in opposition to the teaching and canons of the Church. The bull of reformation published after this, *Supernae dispositionis arbitrio*, was concerned with the higher appointments in the Church, elections, postulations, provisions, the deposing and translation of prelates, *commendams*, unions, dispensations, reservations; with Cardinals and the Curia; reform in the life of priests and laity; the incomes and immunities of clerics; the wide spread of superstition and false Christianity. The reform of the Calendar was also debated, but at the tenth sitting (May, 1515) proved still unripe for discussion; the sitting was then devoted to the contentions of the bishops and the regular clergy; resolutions were passed concerning money-lenders; and Leo's bull pointed out the duty of furthering beneficial modern institutions. Of great interest is the bull concerning the printing and publishing of books: it attributes the invention of printing to the favour of Heaven, but adds that what was made for the glory of God ought not to be used against Him, for which reason all new books were to be subjected to the censorship of the Bishops and Inquisitors.

The eleventh sitting was occupied with the complaints of the Bishops against the Regulars, whom Aegidius of Viterbo defended (December 19, 1516). It was declared unlawful to foretell coming misfortunes from the pulpit with any reference to a definite date; this was probably a retarded censure on Savonarola. The bull *Pastor Aeternus* was issued, which proclaimed the abolition of the Pragmatic Sanction. Leo declared it null and void, and confirmed the decision of the bull *Unam Sanctam* issued by Boniface VIII, that all Christians are subject to the Pope. At this point the ordinances for the clergy and their privileges were read. At the twelfth sitting Giovanni Francesco Pico della Mirandola presented his *Oratio de Reformandis Moribus* to the Pope. In it he announces to Leo that should the Pope delay healing the wounds of society, He whose representative the Pope was would cut off the corrupted members with fire and sword, and scatter them abroad, sending a terrible judgment on the Church. Christ, he said, had cast out the doves and pigeons that were sold in the Temple; why should not Leo exile the worshippers of the many Golden Calves, who had not only a place, but a place of command in Rome? This again was a reminiscence of Savonarola's sermons. Pico had constituted himself his biographer and apologist. It was strange that the flaming words of the prophet should rise once more from the grave at the moment when their terrible prophecy was to be fulfilled in Germany.

On March 16, 1517, the Council closed with its twelfth sitting. It had made many useful orders, and shown good intentions to abolish various abuses. But the carrying out of the contemplated reforms of the Curia was entirely neglected. The Council was from first to last a dead letter, and, even had it gained effect for its resolutions, the

catastrophe in the north would not have been averted. For there an inward alienation from Rome had long been going on, ever since the days of Ludwig the Bavarian; little was needed to make it externally also an accomplished fact. Neither Leo nor his Lateran Council had the slightest conception of this state of affairs north of the Alps.

The government of the Church was entirely in the hands of Italians; the Curia could count scarcely more than one or two Germans or English in their number. Terrible retribution was at hand. Leo X had seen no trace of the coming religious crisis, although its forerunners Reuchlin and Erasmus, Wimpheling and Hutten, and the appearance of *Obscurorum Virorum Epistolae* might well have opened his eyes. His announcement in the midst of all this ferment of the great Absolution for the benefit of St Peter's was a stupendous miscalculation, due to the thoughtless and contemptuous treatment vouchsafed to German affairs in Rome. Instead of directing his most serious attention to them Leo had meantime made his covenant with Francis I at Bologna (December, 1515), on which followed directly the French treaty of 1516. At Bologna the King had renounced the Pragmatic Sanction, in return for which the Pope granted him the right of nomination to bishoprics, abbeys, and conventual priories. It was the most immoral covenant that Church history had hitherto recorded, for the parties presented each other with things that did not belong to them. The French Church fell a victim to an agreement which delivered over her freedom to royal despotism; in return Francis I undertook that the Pope's family should rule in Florence, and as a pledge of the treaty gave a French Princess to the Pope's nephew Lorenzo in marriage.

The hour in which this compact was made was the darkest in Leo's pontificate. North of the Alps this act undermined all confidence in him or in his cousin Clement VII. No further reform of the Church was expected of two Popes who cared more for their dynasty than for the welfare of Christendom. The short interregnum of Adrian VI was, as we have seen, not equal to the task of carrying out the reformation. But it must be remembered that in his reign the worthiest representative of the Church's conscience during the Medicean era came forward once more with a plea for reform. The great document, laid before the Pope at his command, by Aegidius of Viterbo, revealed the disease, when it pointed to the misuse of papal power as the cause of all the harm, and demanded a limitation to the absolutism of the Head of the Church. This tallied with the Pope's ideas, and the celebrated instruction issued to the Nuncio Chieregato (1522), which announced that the disease had come from the head to the members, from the Pope to the prelates, and confessed, "We have all sinned, and there is not one that doeth good."

Alessandro Farnese came forth from the Conclave of 1534 on October 12 as Paul III. A pupil of Pomponio Leto, and at the age of

twenty-five, in 1493, invested with the purple by Alexander VI, he had taken part in all phases of the humanistic movement, and shared its glories and its sins. Now the sky had become overcast, but a clear sunny gleam from the best time of the Renaissance still lay over him, though his pontificate was to witness the inroad of Lutheranism on Italy, the appearance of the doctrine of justification by faith, and on the other hand the foundation of the Society of Jesus (September 3, 1539), the convocation of the long wished-for Ecumenical Council of Trent (1542), and also the reorganisation of the Inquisition (1541).

The last Pope of the Renaissance, as we must call Farnese, left as the brightest memory of his reign the record of an effort, which proved fruitless, to unite the last and noblest supporters of the Renaissance who still survived in the service of the Church, for an attempt at reformation. This is celebrated as the *Consultum delectorum Cardinalium et aliorum prelatorum de emendanda Ecclesia*, and bears the signatures of Contarini, Caraffa, Sadoleto, Reginald Pole, Federigo Fregoso, Giberti, and Cortese. Contarini must be acknowledged to have been the real soul of the movement, which aimed at an inward reconciliation with the German party of reform. All these ideas had root in the conception represented by the scheme of Julius II. The greater number of those who worked at the *Consultum* of 1538 must be regarded as the last direct heirs of this great inheritance. The Religious Conference of Ratisbon in 1541 forms the crisis in the history of this movement: it was wrecked, not, as Reumont states, by the incompatibility of the principle of subjective opinion with that of authority, but quite as much, if not more so, by the private aims of Bavaria and France. So ended the movement towards reconciliation, and another came into force and obtained sole dominion. This regarded the most marked opposition to Protestantism as the salvation of the Church, and to combat it summoned not only the counter-reformation of the *Tridentinum*, but every means in its power, even the extremest measures of material force, to its assistance. The representatives of the conciliatory reform movement, Contarini, Sadoleto, Pole, Morone, became suspect and, despite their dignity of Cardinal, were subject to persecution. Even noble ladies like Vittoria Colonna and Giulia Gonzaga were not secure from this suspicion and persecution.

Paul IV (1555–9) and Pius V (1566–72) carried out the Counter-Reformation in Italy. While the pagan elements of humanism merged in the Antitrinitarian and Socinian sects, the Inquisition was stamping out the *sola fides* belief, but its terrorism at the same time crushed culture and intellectual life out of Italy. The city of Rome recovered from the Sack of 1527; but from the ruin wrought by Caraffa, the nation, or at any rate Papal Rome, never recovered. Whatever intellectual life still remained was forced in the days of Paul III to shrink more and

more from publicity. The sonnets which Vittoria Colonna and Michelangelo exchanged, the converse these two great minds held in the garden of the Villa Colonna, of which Francesco d'Ollanda has left us an account, were the last flickerings of a spirit which had once controlled and enriched the Renaissance.

What comparisons must have forced themselves on Michelangelo as all the events since the days of Lorenzo *il Magnifico*, his first patron, whom he never forgot, passed in review before his great and lonely spirit, now sunk in gloom. We know from Condivi that the impressions Buonarotte had received in his youth exercised a renewed power over his old age. Dante and Savonarola were once his leaders, they had never entirely forsaken him. Now the *favole del mondo*, as his last poems bear witness, fell entirely into the background before the earnest thoughts that had once filled his mind at the foot of the pulpit in San Marco. His *Giudizio Universale* sums up the account for his whole existence, and is at the same time the most terrible reckoning, made in the spirit of Dante, with his own nation and its rulers. All that Italy might have become, had she followed the dictates of Dante and Savonarola, floated before his eyes as his brush created that Judge of all the world whose curse falls on those that have exiled and murdered His prophets, neglected the Church, and bartered away the freedom of the nation. His *Last Judgment* was painted at the bidding of the Pope. Paul III can scarcely have guessed how the artist was searching into the consciences of that whole generation, which was called to execute what Julius had bidden Raffaelle and Michelangelo depict for all Christendom, and which had ignored and neglected its high office.

Since 1541 the Schism was an accomplished fact, a misfortune alike for North and South. The defection of the Germanic world deprived the Catholic Church of an element to which the future belonged after the exhaustion of the Latin races. Perhaps the greatest misfortune lay and still lies, as Newman has said, in the fact that the Latin races never realised, and do not even yet realise, what they have lost in the Germanic races. From the time of Paul III, and still more from that of Paul IV onwards, the old Catholicism changes into an Italianism which adopts more and more the forms of the Roman Curialism. The idea of Catholicity, once so comprehensive, was sinking more and more into a one-sided, often despotic insistence on unity, rendered almost inevitable by the continual struggle with opponents. And this was due, not to the doctrines of the Church, but to her practice. Romanism alone could no longer carry out a scheme such as that of which Julius II had dreamed. It is now clear to all minds what intellectual, moral, and social forces the schism had drawn away; this is manifest even in the fate of Italy. The last remnant of Italian idealism took refuge in the idea of national unity and freedom which had been shadowed forth in the policy of Alexander VI and Julius II, and which Machiavelli had

written on the last wonderful page of his *Principe* as the guiding principle for the future. This vision it was which rose dimly in Dante's mind; for its sake the Italian people had forgiven the sins of the Borgia and of della Rovere; it had appeared to Machiavelli as the highest of aims; after another three hundred years of spiritual and temporal despotism it burst forth once more in the minds of Rosmini, Cesare Balbo, Gioberti, and Cavour, and roused the dishonoured soul of the nation.

CHAPTER II.

HABSBURG AND VALOIS (I).

The secular struggle between the Houses of Burgundy and Valoi reaches a new stage in the era of the Reformation. The murder of th Duke of Orleans in the streets of Paris in 1407 involved at first only junior branch of the French royal House in the blood feud with Burgund. The alliance of Orleans and Armagnac in 1410, and of both wit Charles the Dauphin in 1418, swept in the senior branch, and led to th retributive murder of John of Burgundy at Montereau in 1419. Steadil the area of infection widens. A relentless *Ate* dominates all the earl years of Philip the Good, and then, laid for a while to sleep at Arra (1435), reappears in the days of Charles the Bold. Not only politica and national aims, but an hereditary dynastic hatred might have inspire Louis XI in his campaigns of war and intrigue until the crushing blo at Nancy. The grandson of Charles the Bold, Philip the Fair, seemed in his jealousy of Ferdinand and his devotion to the interests of th Netherlands, to have forgotten the ancestral feud. But his son an heir, whom we know best as Charles the Fifth, inherited, together wit the inconsequent rivalries of Maximilian, and the more enduring an successful antagonism of Ferdinand, the old Burgundian duty of reveng Thus the chronic hostility between the Kings of Valois-Angoulême an the united line of Burgundy, Austria, Castile, and Aragon has a dramati touch of predestined doom, which might find a fitting counterpart in Norse Saga or the Nibelungenlied.

But greater forces than hereditary hate drove Europe to the gulf i which the joy of the Renaissance was for ever extinguished. The terri torial consolidation of the previous age in Europe, though striking, ha been incomplete. The union of the French and Spanish kingdoms ha gone on natural lines. But Italy had been less fortunate. At the deat of Ferdinand her fate was still uncertain. The Spaniards stood firm i Sicily and Naples, the French seemed to stand secure in Milan. Venic had withstood the shock of united Europe. Florence seemed strengthene by the personal protection of the Holy Father. But so long as tw rival foreign Powers held their ground in Italy, consolidation had gon

too far or not far enough. Italy must be either Italian or Spanish or French. The equilibrium was unstable. No amicable arrangement could permanently preserve the *status quo.* The issue could only be solved by the arbitrament of arms.

In Germany the case was different. There consolidation seemed to be out of the question. Neither the preponderance of any single Power, nor that of any combination of Powers, held out hopes of successful conquest. And the German nation, inured to arms, could offer a very different resistance to that which any of the Italian States could maintain. Thus the history of Europe in this period falls into two well marked sections. The Teutonic lands work out their own development under the influence of the new religious thought, unaffected as a whole by the competition for supremacy in Europe. They had their own dangers from the Turk and in civil strife. But the struggle, although ostensibly between the Emperor and the King of France, was in reality between Spain and France for hegemony in western Europe, supremacy in Italy. The struggle was dynastic, but dynasties are the threads about which nations crystallise.

At the outset the forces were not ill-matched. On the death of Ferdinand in 1516 the Archduke Charles succeeded by hereditary right to the kingdoms of Castile and Aragon and their dependencies, to the kingdoms of the two Sicilies, to the Franche-Comté of Burgundy, and to the provinces of the Netherlands. On the death of Maximilian in 1519, he added to these the Habsburg inheritance in eastern Europe, which he wisely resigned before long to his brother Ferdinand. For soldiers he could rely on his Spanish dominions, on the regular forces organised by Charles the Bold in the Netherlands, on the less trustworthy levies of Germany and Italy. The Netherlands and Spain gave him a considerable revenue, which exceeded in gross the revenue of the French King, but was not equally available for common dynastic purposes, owing to the difficulty of exporting and transporting treasure, and the cogent necessities of internal government. The Sicilies might pay for their own government, and provide an occasional supplement, but the resources of these kingdoms hardly compensated for the needs of their defence. The maritime resources of Spain were considerable, but ill-organised and therefore not readily available.

The French King on the other hand, though his dominions were less extensive, had manifest advantages both for attack and defence. His territory was compact, and almost all capacity for internal resistance had been crushed out by the vigorous policy of Louis XI and Anne of Beaujeu. His subjects were rich and flourishing, and far more industrious than those of Spain. All their resources were absolutely at his control. Even the clergy could be relied upon for ample subsidies. His financial system was superior to that of any other existing State. He could make such laws and impose such taxes as suited his sovereign

pleasure. Since the Concordat of 1516 all important clerical patron was in his hands; and the great ecclesiastical revenues served him a convenient means for rewarding ministers, and attaching to himself t great families whose cadets were greedy of spiritual promotion. I cavalry and artillery were excellent and well organised. His infan had not yet been satisfactorily developed, but his resources permitt him to engage mercenaries, and Germans and Swiss were still ready serve the highest bidder. In defence he could fight upon inter lines. For attack he had a ready road to Italy through the frien territories of Savoy. The possession of Milan secured to him t maritime power of Genoa, a very valuable addition to his own.

In character the two potentates were less equally matched. Fran was bold, and vigorous upon occasion, but inconsequent in action; choice of men was directed by favouritism; his attention was divert from business by the pursuit of every kind of pleasure, the more as w as the less refined. His extravagance was such as to hamper his pub activity. To the last he never showed any increasing sense of ro responsibility, and preserved in premature old age the frivolous a vicious habits of his youth.

At the death of Ferdinand Charles was still a boy, and, until t death of Guillaume de Croy, Sire de Chièvres (1521), his own individual did not make itself clearly felt. Chièvres, his old tutor, now his princi minister, dominated his action. Yet at the election to the Empire was his own pertinacity that secured for him the victory when oth would have been content to obtain the prize for his brother Ferdina Throughout his life this pre-eminent trait of manly perseverance ma him with a certain stamp of greatness. Slow in action, deliberate council to the point of irresolution, he yet pursued his ends w unfailing obstinacy until by sheer endurance he prevailed. Extre tenacity in the maintenance of his just rights, moderation in victo and abstinence from all chimerical enterprise, are the other qualities which he owes such success as he obtained. Fortune served him well more than one conspicuous occasion; but he merited her favours. indefatigable patience; and he never made on her exorbitant deman Of his two grandfathers he resembles Ferdinand far more than Ma milian. In the course of his career these characteristics were develop and became more notable; unlike his rival he learnt from life; but fr his youth he was serious, persistent, sober. In his choice of minist and judgment of men he showed himself greatly superior to Fran He was well served throughout his life; and never allowed a minister become his master. Unsympathetic, unimaginative, he lacked the e dearing graces of a popular sovereign; he lacked the gifts that achi greatness. But, born to greatness, he maintained unimpaired t heritage he had received; and, at whatever price of personal a national exhaustion, he left the House of Habsburg greater than

had found it. When we consider the ineluctable burden of his several and discrete realms, the perplexing and multifarious dangers to which he was exposed, the mere mechanical friction occasioned by distance and boundaries and intervening hostile lands, the inefficient organisation, political, financial, and military, of his countries at that time, the obstacles opposed by institutions guarding extinct and impossible local privilege, the world-shaking problems which broke up all previous settled order, then the conscientious sincerity with which he addressed his mediocre talents to the allotted work must earn for him at least a place in our esteem.

On neither side was the struggle for world-empire. Charles would have been content to recover Milan in self-defence, and the duchy of Burgundy as his hereditary and indefeasible right. France had good grounds for claiming Milan and Naples. But it is doubtful whether Francis would have been as moderate after victory as Charles.

The struggle can be considered apart from developments in Germany. But it has its reaction on German fortunes. Had Charles not been hampered throughout his career by the contest with France he would not have been forced to temporise with the Reforming movement until it was too late for effective action. The Most Christian King was an unconscious ally of Luther, as he was a deliberate ally of the Turk. Immediately the conflict concerned the fate of Italy. Indirectly it weakened the resistance of Europe to the Reformed opinions, and to the Muslim in Eastern Europe and the Mediterranean.

After Marignano (1515) and the Peace of Noyon (1516), which professed to shelve all outstanding questions and secure perpetual friendship between Spain and France, Europe had peace for a while. It was arranged at Noyon that Charles should take Louise, the daughter of the King of France, to wife, and that the rights over the kingdom of Naples should go with her. Until this babe-in-arms should become his wife, Charles was to pay 100,000 crowns a year as rent for Naples, and 50,000 until she bore him a son. If Louise died, some daughter of a later birth was to be substituted as his affianced bride, and this clause actually took effect. Charles promised satisfaction with regard to Spanish Navarre, conquered by Ferdinand in 1512; perhaps he even secretly engaged himself to restore it to Catharine, its lawful Queen, within six months. The treaty was concluded under the influence of Flemish counsellors, who had surrounded Charles, since he had taken up the government of the Netherlands in the previous year. It was inspired by a desire for peace with France in interests exclusively Burgundian. But it had also its value for Spain, for it gave Charles a breathing space in which to settle the affairs of his new kingdoms. Maximilian, now in isolation, was forced to come to terms with France and Venice, and surrender Verona; and peace was secured in Italy for a while. At a subsequent conference at Cambray in 1517 the partition of Italy between Habsburg and Valois

was discussed, but nothing was definitely settled. English diplomatists looked on askance at the apparent reconciliation, but their hopes of fishing in troubled waters were soon revived.

Charles utilised the respite for his visit to Spain in 1517. While here he was not only occupied with the troublesome affairs of his new kingdoms, but with the question of the Empire. Maximilian, who, although not yet sixty years of age, was worn out by his tumultuous life, was anxious to secure the succession to his grandson. At the Diet of Augsburg, 1518, he received the promise of the Electors of Mainz, Cologne, the Palatinate, Brandenburg, and Bohemia for the election of Charles as Roman King. The French King was already in the field, but the promises and influence of Maximilian, and the money which Charles was able to supply, overbore for the moment this powerful antagonism. On the receipt of this news Pope Leo X, who had already been attracted to the side of France, was seriously alarmed. The union of the imperial power with the throne of Naples was contrary to the time-honoured doctrines of papal policy. Thenceforward he declared himself more openly a supporter of the French claims. Meanwhile, if Charles was to be elected before Maximilian's death, the latter must first receive from the Pope the imperial crown. This Leo refused to facilitate. In all this the Pope showed himself as ever more mindful of the temporal interests of the Roman See and of his own dynastic profit, than of the good of Europe or religion. Both in the coming struggle with victorious Islam, and against the impending religious danger, an intimate alliance with Charles was of far more value than the support of France. But the meaner motives prevailed.

On January 19, 1519, Maximilian died, and the struggle broke out in a new form. The promises of the Electors proved to be of no account. All had to be done over again. The zeal of his agents, his more abundant supplies of ready cash, the support of the Pope, at first gave Francis the advantage Troubles broke out in the Austrian dominions. Things looked black in Spain. Even the wise Margaret of Savoy lost hope, and recommended that Ferdinand should be put forward in place of Charles. Charles showed himself more resolute and a better judge of the situation. He had friends in Germany, Germans, who understood German politics better than the emissaries of Francis. The influence of England on either side was discounted by Henry VIII's own candidature. German opinion was decidedly in favour of a German election, and although Charles was by birth, education, and sympathy a Netherlander, yet the interests of his House in Germany were important, and it may not have been generally known how little German were his predilections. The great house of Fugger came courageously to his aid and advanced no less than 500,000 florins. The advantage of this support lay not only in the sum supplied, but in the preference of the Electors for Augsburg bills. The Elector of Mainz refused to accept

any paper other than the obligations of well-known German merchants. At the critical moment Francis could not get credit. The Swabian League forbade the merchants of Augsburg to accept his bills. He endeavoured in vain to raise money in Genoa and in Lyons.

It is needless to pursue the base intrigues and tergiversations of the several Electors. The Elector of Saxony played the most honourable part, for he refused to be a candidate himself, and declined all personal gratification. The Elector of Mainz showed himself perhaps the most greedy and unfaithful. He received 100,000 florins from Charles alone and the promise of a pension of 10,000, which it is satisfactory to note was not regularly paid. Money on the one hand, and popular pressure on the other decided the issue. The Rhinelands, where the possessions of four Electors lay and where the election was to take place, were enthusiastic for the Habsburg candidature. It was here that the national idea was strongest, and the humanists were eloquent in their support of Maximilian's grandson. The army of the Swabian League, under Franz von Sickingen, the great German *condottiere*, was ready to act on behalf of Charles; it had been recently engaged in evicting the Duke Ulrich of Wurttemberg from his dominions, and was now secured by Charles for three months for his own service. Here also money had its value. Sickingen and the Swabian League received 171,000 florins. At the end the Pope gave way and withdrew his opposition. On June 28, 1519, the Electors at Frankfort voted unanimously for the election of Charles. The election cost him 850,000 florins.

It is a commonplace of historians to exclaim at the fruitless waste of energy involved in this electoral struggle, and to point out that Charles was not richer or more powerful as Emperor than he was before; while on the other hand his obligations and anxieties were considerably increased. But so long as prestige plays its part in human affairs, so long a reasonable judgment will justify the ambition of Charles. He was still perhaps in the youthful frame of mind which willingly and ignorantly courts responsibility and faces risks, the frame of mind in which he entered on his first war with Francis, saying, "Soon he will be a poor King or I shall be a poor Emperor." But the imperial Crown was in some sort hereditary in his race. Had he pusillanimously refused it, his prestige must have suffered severely. As a German prince he could not brook the interference of a foreign and a hostile power in the affairs of Germany. The imperial contest was inevitable, and was in fact the peaceful overture to another contest, equally inevitable, and more enduring, waged over half a continent, through nearly forty years.

War was in fact inevitable, and Charles was ill-prepared to meet it. His affairs in Spain went slowly, and it was not until May, 1520, that Charles was able to sail for the north, leaving open revolt at Valencia, and discontent in his other dominions. The fortunate issue of these

complications has been related in the first volume of this *History*. Diplomacy had already paved the way for an understanding with Henry VIII, which took more promising shape at Gravelines, after a visit to Henry at Dover and Canterbury, and the famous interview of Henry VIII and Francis I at the Field of the Cloth of Gold. Wolsey's skilful diplomacy had brought it about that both the greatest monarchs of Europe were bidding eagerly for his and his master's favour. A pension and a bishopric for the Cardinal, a renewal for England of the commercial treaty with the Netherlands were the preliminary price. At Gravelines it was agreed that Charles and Henry should have the same friends and the same enemies; and that neither Power should conclude an alliance with any other without the consent of both. If war broke out between Charles and Francis, Henry was to act against the aggressor. For two years the agreements for the marriage of the Dauphin with the English Princess Mary, and of Charles with Charlotte the daughter of Francis (Louise having died) were to receive no further confirmation. Towards the end of this period another meeting was to take place at which another agreement should be concluded. Each Power was to maintain a regular ambassador at the Court of the other. The pains taken by Wolsey to reassure Francis and to show that Henry had rejected propositions from Charles for a joint attack on France prove that he was still anxious to prevent the Roman King from drawing near to France; but the nett result of the interviews was to guarantee Charles against any immediate adhesion of England to his rival.

Fortified by this belief, and leaving his aunt Margaret of Savoy to govern the Netherlands with extensive powers, Charles proceeded to his coronation, which took place at Aachen on October 23, 1520. Meanwhile in Castile and Valencia the troubles continued, until the rising of the *Comuneros* was definitely crushed at the battle of Villalar, April 24, 1521. Charles was thus relieved from one of his worst anxieties, though the condition of his finances was so bad that he could only look with alarm on the prospect of war. All his Spanish revenues were pledged and nothing could be expected from that source. Still the outbreak of war was delayed, and he was able to bring the Diet of Worms to a close before any decisive step was needed. And more important still, in the eager hunt for alliances on both sides, Charles proved the more successful. On May 29, 1521, a secret alliance had been concluded on his behalf with the Pope.

From the time of the imperial election Leo had foreseen the consequences, and had turned his shallow statecraft to the task of considering what could be got for the Papal See and his own family from the impending war. At first he had urged a prompt and united attack upon Charles, in which France, Venice, and England were to join. This might well have succeeded while Charles was still embroiled in Castile. Then while negotiations with France and England flagged and each Power was

manœuvring for the weather-gauge, Leo began to see that France and Venice could never consent to his favourite scheme for the annexation of Ferrara, the one part of Julius' design which yet remained unexecuted. France was closely linked with Alfonso d' Este, and Venice preferred him as a neighbour to the Pope. Then Leo turned to Charles, and Charles was ready to promise all that he could ask—Parma, Piacenza, Ferrara, imperial protection for the Medici, the restoration of Francesco Sforza in Milan and the Adorni in Genoa, and the suppression of the enemies of the Catholic faith. In return the Pope promised the investiture of Naples, and a defensive alliance. Leo would have been glad to make the alliance offensive, but the Emperor was in no hurry for war, and still hoped that it might be averted.

The alliance with Leo was valuable to Charles for the resources, material and spiritual, which the Pope and the Medici controlled, for the protection which the Papal States afforded against attacks on Naples from the north, and for the access they gave to Lombardy from the south. Still more valuable appeared the alliance with England, as securing the Netherlands against a joint attack. Wolsey at first was anxious to play the part of mediator or arbitrator between the hostile powers. At length at Bruges the agreement was reached on August 25. Chièvres was dead (May 18, 1521), and Charles took himself the leading part in these negotiations. Charles was to marry Mary, the daughter of Henry VIII. The Emperor and King entered the most solemn alliance not only for the defence of their present possessions, but for the recovery of all that they could severally claim. The Emperor, who was meditating a visit to Spain, was to visit England on the way. War was to be openly declared in March, 1523. But if no suspension of hostilities came about between Charles and France, the declaration of war was to take place on the occasion of Charles' visit to England. All this was to be secured by the most solemn and public declarations within four months.

The treaty of alliance, solemn as it professed to be, left something to be desired. France was already effectively at war with Charles. Robert de la Marck, Lord of Bouillon and Sedan, early in the year had invaded the southern Netherlands, and Duke Charles of Gelders, an old ally of France and enemy of the Burgundian rulers, had attacked the north. Henri d'Albret had marched into Navarre, and at first had met with considerable success. These attacks were manifestly supported by France, and Charles could therefore claim the aid of England by virtue of earlier treaties as the victim of unprovoked aggression. But for the time being it must suffice that England was neutralised. In the border warfare which succeeded Charles could hold his own. Sickingen chastised the Lord of Bouillon. Henri d'Albret was driven from Navarre by local levies. And although on the frontier of the Netherlands things looked black for a while, though Mezières under Bayard held out against attack

and the Emperor himself risked a serious defeat near Valenciennes, though the Admiral Bonnivet succeeded in occupying Fuenterrabia, the most important position on the western Pyrenees, all was compensated and more than compensated by the seizure of Milan on November 19, 1521, by the joint forces of the Emperor and the Pope. Lombardy with the exception of a few fortresses was easily occupied, and in the north Tournay capitulated. After these astonishing successes the death of Leo, on December 1, came as an unexpected blow to the imperial hopes. But his aid had done its work. His support had been the chief instrument in preventing the Swiss from assisting Francis with their full force; papal and Florentine money had supplied the needs of the joint expedition. In return he received before his death the news that Parma and Piacenza had been recovered for the Holy See.

The campaign in Lombardy had been conducted by Prospero Colonna, in command of the papal and imperial forces, among which were 16,000 German infantry, brought by way of Trent. The French army was commanded by Odet de Foix, Vicomte de Lautrec, who owed his position to his sister's favour with the French King. They were joined by a considerable contingent from Venice. The Spanish troops under Antonio de Leyva and the Marquis of Pescara came up slowly from Naples; operations began badly; no plan of campaign commanded approval; and when at length the siege of Parma was undertaken, it had to be abandoned owing to danger from Ferrara. In October, however, on the news of the approach of a body of Swiss, whom the Pope had induced to serve for the protection of the Holy See, Colonna crossed the Po. Giovanni de' Medici defeated a Venetian force, and the Marquis of Ferrara suffered a defeat. Lautrec failed to prevent the junction of Colonna with the Swiss. There were now Swiss in both armies, and the orders of the Swiss Diet came to both armies that they were to return. But the papal contingent held firm, while those in the pay of the French deserted in great numbers. Colonna forced the passage of the Adda, and Lautrec retired on Milan, where the exactions and repressive measures of the French provoked a Ghibelline rising, as soon as the enemy appeared before the walls. The Venetians led the flight, and Lautrec abandoned the city for Como, whence he passed to winter in the Venetian territory.

The strange election of Adrian of Utrecht to the papal throne, which followed on the death of Leo, appeared at first to favour the imperial side. Adrian had been the Emperor's tutor and was left by him as regent in Castile in 1520. But Adrian's visionary and unworldly character unfitted him to take the traditional part of the Popes in Italian politics. It was long before he appeared in Italy, and after his arrival he long endeavoured to maintain neutrality. At last, about a month before his death in September, 1523, Adrian was forced to take a side, and joined the Emperor.

The news of the successes in Lombardy put an end to the exertions

of Wolsey to conclude an armistice between the Powers, and to secure his own acceptance as arbitrator. The alliance with England was confirmed, and Charles was free to sail for Spain (May 26, 1522). On his way he landed at Dover and visited Henry; and on June 19 the treaty of Windsor was concluded, according to which both sovereigns were bound to invade France each with a force of 30,000 foot, and 10,000 horse; the date named for this great effort was May, 1524.

In July, 1522, Charles reached Spain and the last remnants of rebellion were stamped out. Meanwhile his armies in Italy had been left almost to their own resources. The ample supplies voted by the Netherlands in 1521 had been all expended in the war of that year. No more money was forthcoming from the Pope or Florence. A great part of the imperial army had to be disbanded. The death of Leo threw the Swiss entirely on to the side of France. The French King moreover found no more difficulty in hiring German *Landsknechte* than did the Emperor himself. In the Papal State the forces of disorder reigned unchecked, and the old tyrants reappeared in Urbino, Camerino, Rimini, and Perugia. Early in March, 1522, Lautrec moved across the Adda to join the Swiss who were coming to the number of 16,000 from the passes of the Alps. The junction was effected at Monza. But the defensive works of Colonna executed during the winter rendered Milan impregnable to assault. The enthusiastic support of the Milanese provided garrisons for the principal towns of the duchy. Francesco Sforza entered Milan on the 4th of April, and the Milanese were now fighting for a duke of their own. Lautrec, although reinforced by a French force under his brother Thomas de Lescun, could achieve nothing against the defensive strategy of Colonna. At length the impatience of the Swiss, who demanded battle or pay, forced the French to attack the enemy in a strong position of their own choosing, called the Bicocca, three miles from Milan (April 27). Here they were repulsed with considerable loss, the Milanese militia doing good service side by side with the Spaniards and the Germans. The Swiss then returned to their homes, discontented and humiliated, and the French army shortly afterwards evacuated Lombardy, excepting the three castles of Novara, Milan, and Cremona. Genoa was stormed and pillaged by the Imperialists on May 30. A new government was set up in Milan under Francesco Sforza, though the unpaid Spanish and German soldiers recompensed themselves for their arrears by pillage and exactions. In Florence the imperial success restored the Medici authority which had been seriously threatened by malcontents from the Papal States, supported by hopes of French assistance.

The treaty of Windsor led to an immediate declaration of war by Henry VIII, and during the summer of 1522 the English and Spanish fleet raided the coasts of Britanny and Normandy. Later an invading force under the Earl of Surrey and the Count van Buren entered Picardy,

but little was achieved against the defensive opposition of the French. A systematic devastation of hostile country took place in this region.

In spite of their ill-success in two campaigns the French did not give up their hope of reconquering Milan. Financial distress had again forced the Emperor to reduce his forces, and the necessary means were with difficulty collected from the Italian towns and princes. The Netherlands had up to this time been the only trustworthy source of revenue, and the expenditure of Charles' Court had made great inroads upon his treasury. Money was now coming in to the Castilian exchequer, but these funds had been pledged in advance. The Italian army was a year in arrear. Ferdinand was begging for money for measures against the Turks. The desperate appeal of Rhodes for aid in 1522 had to pass unregarded, and this outlying bulwark of Christendom capitulated at the close of 1522. Although Charles was in Spain to stimulate operations, Fuenterrabia was successfully defended by the French against all attacks until February, 1524.

On the other hand, since the autumn of 1522 the allies had been counting on powerful aid in France itself. The Duke of Bourbon, with his extended possessions in the centre of France, was almost the only remaining representative of the great appanaged princes of the fifteenth century. Although his wings had been clipped by legislative and even more by administrative changes, he still commanded a princely revenue and considerable local support. His position in the kingdom had been recognised by the gift of the highest of Crown offices, the post and dignity of Constable of France. But his title to the vast possessions which he held was not beyond question. The duchy of Bourbon had been preserved from reunion with the Crown under Louis XII by the influence of Anne, Duchess of Bourbon, better known as Anne of Beaujeu, who first procured for her daughter Susanne the right to succeed her father in the duchy (1498), and then (1505) married her to Count Charles of Montpensier, her cousin, who represented the rights of a younger branch of the Bourbon House. By this marriage Charles of Montpensier was elevated to the duchy of Bourbon, but when his wife Susanne died without issue in 1521 his title became questionable at law. From motives probably of cupidity, and of cupidity alone, a double claim was now advanced against him. The Queen Mother, Duchess of Angoulême, claimed the female fiefs as being more closely related to the main line of the Bourbon House, and the King claimed the male fiefs as escheating to the Crown. Against claimants so powerful Charles of Bourbon felt himself unable to litigate before the Parliament of Paris. The points of law were nice and the tribunal amenable to royal influence. He turned therefore to the enemies of his country. He approached Charles V and boldly asked for his sister Eleonora (widow of the King of Portugal) in marriage, offering in return to raise 500 men-at-arms and 8000 foot-soldiers and to co-operate with an invasion from the east.

But the intrigues became known, and although the King hesitated to arrest his Constable when he had him at Paris in his power, and though again in August, 1523, when the King passed through Moulins to take part in the great expedition to Italy, the Constable was allowed to stay behind on a plea of sickness, at length a peremptory summons was sent ordering him to join the King at Lyons. On this the Duke, who had been looking in vain for the approach of aid from the east, took to flight and, after attempting to escape to Spain by way of Roussillon, succeeded at length in reaching the frontier of Franche-Comté.

The elaborate plans of the allies, which included the despatch of a force of 10,000 *Landsknechte* to Bourbon, an invasion of Picardy by a joint army of 21,000 men, and an attack on Languedoc with 34,000 men from Spain, were thus defeated. The Constable brought with him only his name and his sword. But the danger was judged sufficiently real to prevent Francis from leading his army in person into the Milanese, as had been intended. Great preparations had been made for an expedition on a royal scale, but the Admiral Bonnivet was appointed to take command instead of the King. While Bonnivet was advancing on Italy some attempt was made by the allies to execute the other parts of the plan. The Duke of Suffolk and the Count van Buren advanced by Picardy to the neighbourhood of Compiègne and Senlis, the German force threatened the frontier from the side of Bresse, while a Spanish force crossed the Pyrenees in October and threatened Bayonne. The delays had shattered the effect of the combination, but the kingdom was almost undefended, and even Paris was thought to be insecure. Yet little came of all these efforts. The Germans from Bresse made an ineffectual attempt to join with Suffolk and Buren, but were hunted back across the frontier by the Count of Guise. The leaders of the northern expedition showed little enterprise, and money as usual was deficient. The Spanish army advanced upon Bayonne, but was repulsed by the vigorous defence of Lautrec, and retired ineffective. In spite of a liberal subsidy in August from the Cortes of Castile, and the seizure in October of gold coming on private account from the Indies, the great design for the partition of France proved entirely abortive.

Meanwhile Bonnivet had pursued his path to Lombardy. His army consisted of 1500 men-at-arms and some 25,000 foot, Swiss, Germans, French, and Italians. On the 14th of September he reached the Ticino. Prospero Colonna, who was in command of the imperial troops, had no adequate resources with which to resist so powerful a foe in the field. Adrian VI, it is true, had recently announced his reluctant adhesion to the imperial party, and about the same time Venice had renounced her French alliance and concluded a league with Charles. But the value of these accessions had not begun to be felt when Adrian's death (September 14) introduced uncertainty afresh at the very moment when

Bonnivet appeared in Italy. Colonna was no longer supported by Pescara, but he had at his disposition Giovanni de' Medici, the celebrated leader of the Black Italian Bands, and Antonio de Leyva. The imperial leaders abandoned the western part of the duchy to the French and retired on Milan. If Bonnivet had pressed on he would have found the capital unready for defence. But his delay gave time to improvise protection: and when he arrived an assault appeared impracticable. He determined to endeavour to reduce the city by famine.

Besides Milan, Colonna still held Pavia, Lodi, and Cremona, and wisely confined his efforts to the retention of these important posts. Bonnivet divided his forces and sent Bayard to attack Lodi and Cremona. Lodi fell, but Cremona held out, and Bayard had to be recalled. The election of Clement VII on November 19 gave for the moment strength to the imperial side. Money was sent and the Marquis of Mantua brought aid. Bonnivet was forced to abandon the siege of Milan, and retire upon the Ticino. On December 28 Prospero Colonna died, but Charles de Lannoy, the viceroy of Naples, with the Marquis of Pescara, arrived to take his place, bringing with him a small supply of money and troops. Reinforcements came from Germany, and the Imperialists, now supported more effectively by Venice, were able to take the offensive. They drove Bonnivet from Abbiate-Grasso, then from Vigevano to Novara. The reinforcements which he was eagerly expecting from the Grisons at length arrived at Chiavenna, but found neither men nor money to meet them Giovanni de' Medici hung upon their flanks and drove the Grisons levies back over the mountains. At length Bonnivet was forced to leave Novara and endeavour to effect a junction with a force of 8000 Swiss, whom he met upon the Sesia. But this relief was too late. The *moral* of the army was destroyed. The remnants could only be saved by retreat. Bonnivet himself was wounded at this juncture, and the task of conducting the wearied and dispirited troops across the mountains fell upon Bayard. Bayard took command of the rear-guard, and, in protecting the movements of his comrades, fell mortally wounded by the ball of an arquebus (April 30, 1524). With him perished the finest flower of the French professional army in that age, the knight who had raised the ideal of a warrior's life to the highest point. But his last task was successfully accomplished. The Swiss effected their retreat by Aosta, the French by Susa and Briançon. The last garrison of the French in Lombardy capitulated.

Adrian's successor, Giulio de' Medici, Clement VII, had been supported in his election by the imperial influence, in spite of Charles' promises to Wolsey. Giulio had long controlled the papal policy under Leo, and it was assumed that he would tread the same path. But Clement had all the defects of his qualities. Supremely subtle and acute, he had not the constancy to follow up what he had once come to regard as a mistake. He relied upon his own ingenuity and duplicity,

and endeavoured to sail with every wind. Thus he failed alike to serve his own interests and those of his allies.

Clement began almost at once to detach himself from the imperial alliance, dangerous in defeat, oppressive in the event of success. His efforts however to conclude a truce proved unsuccessful, and on May 25, 1524, a new compact was accepted by the allies. The Duke of Bourbon was to invade France at the head of the victorious army of Italy. A joint expedition was to invade Picardy, and a Spanish army was to attack by way of Roussillon. Henry VIII seemed to see a chance of making good the pretensions of his ancestors to the French throne, and exacted from the unwilling Duke of Bourbon an oath of fidelity to himself as King of France.

In July the first point of this agreement was carried into effect. The Duke of Bourbon crossed the Alps in company with Pescara and invaded France (July 1). His artillery joined him by sea at Monaco. Provence offered little resistance. The Duke entered Aix on August 9. But the other movements were delayed, and it was thought dangerous to advance on Lyons without this support. Accordingly it was determined to lay siege to Marseilles, which was surrounded on August 19. Francis had here shown unusual foresight, and the town was prepared for defence under the command of the Orsini captain, Renzo da Ceri, who had shown himself throughout a passionate friend of France. The breaches in the walls were immediately protected by earthworks, and the besiegers could not venture an assault. The French navy, reinforced by Andrea Doria with his galleys, was superior to the invaders on the sea. Meanwhile Francis was collecting with great energy an army of relief at Avignon. Unexampled *tailles* were imposed; the clergy were taxed, the cities gave subsidies, and the nobles forced loans. Time pressed and the assault of Marseilles was ordered for September 4, but the troops recoiled before the danger; the Marquis of Pescara, hostile throughout to the enterprise and its leader, did not conceal his disapproval; and the project was abandoned. The promised aid from Roussillon was not sent, and the diversion in Picardy was not made. On September 29, much against his will, the Duke of Bourbon ordered the retreat. The troops, ill-clothed, ill-provided, ill-shod, made their way across the mountains, closely pursued by Montmorency. Francis followed with his whole army and reached Vercelli on the same day that the retreating army arrived at Alba, about sixteen miles S.S.W. of Asti.

With troops humiliated, discontented, exhausted, resistance in the field was impossible. The imperialists adopted the same strategy that had succeeded so well against Bonnivet. They determined to hold Alessandria, Pavia, Lodi, Pizzighettone, Cremona. The citadel of Milan was garrisoned, and it was hoped that the city might be held; but it had suffered terribly from the plague, and on the approach of Francis

with his whole army, the attempt was given up. Bourbon, Lannoy, and Pescara retired to Lodi; and the defence of Pavia was entrusted to Antonio de Leyva. Instead of following up the remnants of the imperial army to Lodi, and crushing them or driving them east into the arms of their uncertain Venetian allies, Francis turned aside to make himself master of Pavia. The siege artillery opened fire on November 6. An early assault having failed, Francis attempted to divert the course of the Ticino, and by this means to obtain access to the south side of the town, which relied mainly on the protection of the river. But the winter rains rendered the work impossible. Francis determined to reduce the city by blockade. Meanwhile he called up reinforcements from the Swiss, and took Giovanni de' Medici into his pay.

Italy prepared to take the side which appeared for the moment stronger. Venice hesitated in her alliance. Clement, while endeavouring to reassure the Emperor as to his fidelity, and ostensibly negotiating for an impossible peace, concluded, on December 12, 1524, a secret treaty with France, in which Florence and Venice were included. This treaty led both Clement and Francis to their ruin. Clement paid for his cowardly betrayal at the Sack of Rome, and Francis was encouraged to detach a part of his army under the Duke of Albany to invade Naples, an enterprise which weakened his main force without securing any corresponding advantage. The Duke, after holding to ransom the towns of Italy through which he passed, reached the south of the papal territory, where he was attacked by the Colonna and driven back to Rome. It was hoped however that this diversion would induce the imperial generals to leave Lombardy to its fate and hurry to the protection of Naples. But reinforcements were coming in from Germany under Frundsberg, and it was Naples that was left to fortune. On January 24, 1525, the imperial forces moved from Lodi. After a feint on Milan, they approached Pavia, and encamped towards the east to wait their opportunity. Thence they succeeded in introducing powder and other most necessary supplies into the famished city. The seizure of Chiavenna on behalf of Charles recalled the Grisons levies to the defence of their own territory. Reinforcements coming to Francis from the Alps were cut off and destroyed. Giovanni de' Medici was incapacitated by a wound. But the condition of the beleaguered city and lack of pay and provisions did not permit of further delay. It was decided to attack Francis in his camp and risk the issue.

On the night of February 24-25 the imperial army broke into the walled enclosure of the park of Mirabello. Delays were caused by the solid walls and day broke before the actual encounter. The news of the attack induced Francis to leave his entrenchments and to muster his army, which consisted of 8000 Swiss, 5000 Germans, 7000 French infantry, and 6000 Italians. He was not much superior in actual

numbers, but stronger in artillery and cavalry. An attempt of the imperialists to join hands with the garrison of Pavia, by marching past the French army, which had had time to adopt a perfect order of battle in the park, proved impossible under a flanking artillery fire. Nor was it possible to throw up earthworks and await assault, as Lannoy had hoped. A direct attack upon the French army was necessary. In the *mêlée* which ensued it is almost impossible to disentangle the several causes of the issue, but it seems clear that the complete victory of the imperialists was due to the admirable fire-discipline and tactics of the veteran Spanish arquebusiers, to the attack of Antonio de Leyva with his garrison from the rear, to an inopportune movement of the German troops of the French which masked their artillery fire, and perhaps in some measure to the cowardly example of flight set by the Duke of Alençon. The French army was destroyed, the French King was captured, and all his most illustrious commanders were taken prisoners or killed. As Ravenna marks the advent of artillery as a deciding factor in great battles, so perhaps Pavia may be said to mark the superiority attained by hand firearms over the pike. The Swiss pikemen were unable to stand against the Spanish bullets.

Once more the duchy had been reconquered, and it seemed lost for ever to France. Francis was sent as a prisoner first to Pizzighettone and then to Spain. Here the unwonted restraint acting on a man so passionately devoted to field-sports shook his health; he thought at one time of resigning the crown of France in favour of the Dauphin, in order to discount the advantage possessed by Charles in the custody of his royal person; but he was at length constrained to accept the Emperor's terms. The result was the treaty of Madrid, signed by Francis on January 14, 1526, and confirmed by the most solemn oaths, and by the pledge of the King's knightly honour, but with the deliberate and secretly expressed intention of repudiating its obligations. Francis was to marry Eleonora, the Emperor's sister and the widow of the King of Portugal. He renounced all his rights over Milan, Naples, Genoa, Asti, together with the suzerainty of Flanders, Artois, and Tournay. He ceded to Charles the duchy of Burgundy, in which however the traditional dependencies of the duchy were not included. The Duke of Bourbon was to be pardoned and restored to his hereditary possessions. Francis abandoned the Duke of Gelders, and gave up all claims of d'Albret to Navarre. As a guarantee for the execution of the treaty the King's two eldest sons were to be surrendered to the Emperor's keeping; and Francis was to return as a prisoner in the event of non-fulfilment.

In spite of the outcries of historians, the terms of this treaty must be regarded as moderate. Charles exacted nothing, after his extraordinary success, except what he must have considered to be his own by right. But how far his moderation was dictated by policy, and how far

by natural feelings of justice, may remain undecided. The Duke of Bourbon and Henry VIII had pressed upon him the pursuit of the war the invasion and dismemberment of France. Had Charles really aimed at European supremacy this course was open to him. But he did not take it, whether from a prudent distrust of his English ally, or from an honest dislike for unjust and perilous schemes of aggrandisement. That he took no pains to use his own victory for the furtherance of the ends of England, may appear at first sight surprising. But Henry VIII had had no part in the victory of Pavia, and almost none in any of Charles' successes. English subsidies had been a factor, though not a decisive factor, in the war, but English armed assistance had been uniformly ineffective. Even before the battle of Pavia Charles had known of Henry's contemplated change of side. Moreover, since the rejection of Henry's plans for the dismemberment of France, the English King had concluded an alliance with Louise of Savoy, the regent of France, and profited by his desertion to the extent of two millions of crowns. Charles owed nothing to Henry at the time of the treaty of Madrid.

Other considerations of a politic nature may have inclined Charles to moderation. The Pope, appalled by the disaster of Pavia, had been preparing against the Emperor an Italian league. Francesco Sforza had been approached and had lent an ear to proposals of infidelity. Venice was secured. Even Pescara, Charles' own servant, had been sounded by Girolamo Morone, the Chancellor of Milan, with the offer of the Kingdom of Naples. Pescara was discontented with the favour and good fortune of Lannoy, with his own position, the conditions of his service, and his rewards. He seems to have hesitated for a moment, but eventually disclosed all to Charles, and threw Morone into prison (July—October, 1525). Sforza was deprived of the chief places in the Milanese, retaining only the citadels of Milan and Cremona; but all this meant further trouble in Italy, and pointed to an understanding with France, although Mercurino Gattinara throughout had urged that no reliance should be placed on French promises. Charles deserves credit for his prudence, if not for his generosity. The notion that Francis' permanent friendship could have been won by any greater liberality can be at once dismissed.

Francis I was liberated at the French frontier on March 17, 1526, leaving his two little sons in his place. He at once made known his intentions by delaying and finally refusing the ratification of the treaty of Madrid; and on May 22, at Cognac, a League was concluded against the Emperor, in which Francesco Sforza, the Pope, Florence, and Venice joined with France. Sforza was to receive the duchy of Milan unimpaired, the States of Italy were to be restored to all their rights, and the French Princes were to be released for a ransom of 2,000,000 crowns. Henry VIII gave fair words and encouragement in abundance, but did not join the League. The aid of France was equally illusory. The

allies talked of peace, but in reality they courted war, and with it all the disasters which followed.

The adhesion, however vacillating, of Henry VIII to the party of his enemies, set Charles free from any obligations towards Mary of England, and in March, 1526, he concluded his marriage with Isabella of Portugal, a union which he had long desired, securing to him an ample dowry, and promising peace between the two Iberian kingdoms. The affairs of Italy still occupied his attention. Francesco Sforza received the first blow. Pescara was dead, but Charles still had able and devoted servants in Italy. With the troops at their disposal Antonio de Leyva and Alfonso del Guasto besieged Francesco Sforza in the citadel of Milan. After the League of Cognac had been concluded the allies advanced to his relief. The imperialists were in piteous case. Left without means of support, they were obliged to live upon the country and to levy money from the citizens of Milan. In consequence they had to deal with an actual revolt of the inhabitants which was with difficulty repressed, while the siege of the citadel was still vigorously maintained. Francesco Maria, Duke of Urbino, moving deliberately and cautiously at the head of the united Venetian and papal army, after seizing Lodi, advanced to the relief of Sforza, and was only at a short distance from the town when the Duke of Bourbon opportunely arrived with a small force (July 5). Bourbon had been named as Duke of Milan to compensate him for the loss of his French possessions which Francis had refused to restore. The Duke of Urbino then commenced an attack, which if vigorously pushed might have resulted in the destruction of the imperialist forces, between the invaders and the citadel, and among a hostile population. But he showed neither resolution nor activity, and on July 25 the citadel surrendered. The Duke of Urbino, now reinforced by some six thousand Swiss, the only aid which Francis supplied, turned to the siege of Cremona, in which he consumed his resources and two months of valuable time. The final capture of the city (September 23) was an inadequate compensation.

The attitude of Charles towards Clement VII at this juncture was expressed in his letter of September 17, 1526, in which the misdeeds of the Pope were systematically set forth. This letter was afterwards printed in Spain, Germany, and the Netherlands as a manifesto to all Christendom. The arraignment was severe but not on the whole unjust. In view of his wrongs, real and supposed, the means used by the Emperor are not surprising. His emissary, Ugo de Moncada, after vainly endeavouring to win back Clement, had turned to the still powerful family of Colonna. These nobles, Ghibellines by tradition, soldiers by profession, and raiders by inclination, after terrifying the Pope by forays in the south and by the capture of Anagni, concluded with him a treacherous peace (August 22). The Pope, already overburdened by his efforts in the north, was thus induced to disarm at home, and on September 20

the Colonna struck at Rome. They penetrated first into the southern part of the town, and then into the Leonine city, where they sacked the papal palace, and the dwellings of several Cardinals. Clement took refuge in the Castle of St Angelo, where he was shortly forced to conclude a truce of four months with the Emperor, promising to withdraw his troops from Lombardy and his galleys from before Genoa, and giving hostages for his good faith. The Emperor disavowed the actions of the allies but profited by the result, which was indeed only partial, since Giovanni de' Medici, with the best of the papal troops, continued to fight for the League, in the name of the King of France. An amnesty promised to the Colonna was disregarded, and in full Consistory their lands were declared to be confiscated, and a force was sent to execute this sentence.

Inert as ever, after the capture of Cremona, the Duke of Urbino allowed three weeks to pass before, strengthened by the arrival of 4000 French, he moved upon Milan, not to assault but to blockade. These delays were invaluable to Charles. They allowed him to win the adhesion of Alfonso, Duke of Ferrara, which was facilitated by the papal hostility. They allowed him to send troops from Spain to Naples (December), and to collect German levies, who arrived in Italy under Frundsberg in November. Their presence in the duchy of Mantua forced the Duke of Urbino to abandon the siege of Milan. He divided his army, leaving a part at Vauri, on the Adda, and advanced with the remainder against Frundsberg, whom he found at Borgoforte near the Po. In the skirmish which followed Giovanni de' Medici was wounded, and he died shortly afterwards at Mantua. The Duke of Urbino gave up all further attempt to prevent the junction of the imperialists, and returned to Mantua. The want of energy displayed by the Duke of Urbino throughout this campaign is not wholly to be attributed to his character. He had a well-grounded mistrust of the troops of which his army was composed, and doubted their competence to face the Spaniards. Moreover the Venetians were uncertain as to the Pope's real intentions and were reluctant to push matters to an extreme. The success of Charles however was principally due to this policy of inaction. The Duke of Bourbon now extorted by the extremest measures the money necessary to enable him to move, requiring, for instance, 20,000 ducats of Morone as the price of his life and pardon, and at length the forces met at Fiorenzuola in the territory of Piacenza (February, 1527). The united army then moved towards the Papal States, watched at a distance by the Duke of Urbino, while garrisons were sent to save Bologna and Piacenza. The Pope, in extreme alarm, threatened by Bourbon from the north and Lannoy with the Colonna from the south, implored Francis to act, and showed himself willing to make whatever terms he could with the Emperor. Then on hearing of a small success of his troops in the south at Frosinone (January, 1527), he determined to pursue the war.

A sudden raid by Renzo da Ceri on the Abruzzi seemed at first to promise a welcome diversion, but very soon the invasions of Naples proved as unprofitable as the campaigns in the north. The project of conferring the kingdom on Louis, Count of Vaudemont, the brother of the Duke of Lorraine, which Clement had put forward, faded into the visionary. The Pope shifted his ground again, and on March 15 concluded a truce of eight months for himself and Florence.

Meanwhile the imperial army had been long inactive at San Giovanni, N.W. of Bologna. Destitute of everything, it was not likely that they would accept a truce which brought them only 60,000 ducats. A meeting had in fact already taken place, and Frundsberg, while endeavouring to pacify his *Landsknechte*, was struck by apoplexy; his days of activity were over. Hereupon came the news of the truce, with its impossible proposals, prolonging the intolerable condition of inaction and want. The army clamoured to go forward and Bourbon decided to lead them. The Count del Guasto, Pescara's nephew, whose Italian patriotism always competed with his duty to his master, protested and withdrew, but on March 30 the others set forth, scantily provided with transport and provisions by the Duke of Ferrara. Clement, on the conclusion of the truce, had disbanded his troops, and while Lannoy was endeavouring on his behalf to raise the money at Florence to appease the imperialists, the tumultuous advance continued. On April 21 Lannoy met Bourbon with 100,000 ducats, but he now demanded more than twice that sum, and the march proceeded down the valley of the Arno, threatening Florence. But the army of the League was near enough to protect that city, and the only result was a futile rising of the citizens, and the accession of Florence to the League. Bourbon then determined to move on Rome, a resolution acceptable above all to his Lutheran followers. The Pope proclaimed his adhesion to the confederates, and clamoured for aid. But it was too late. On May 5 the mutinous army appeared before Rome on the Monte Mario. They had left their artillery on the road, but the city was almost undefended, except for such measures as Renzo da Ceri had been able to take on orders given at the last moment. The next day the Leonine city was assaulted and captured, the Duke of Bourbon being killed at the moment of escalading the wall. Philibert, Prince of Orange, took the command. Clement had only just time to seek refuge in St Angelo.

In the main city Renzo da Ceri endeavoured to persuade the Romans to protect themselves by breaking down the bridges, and preventing the entry of the Colonna from the south. But he failed. The Trastevere was easily captured, and the imperialists advanced without opposition across the bridge of Sixtus. For eight days the Sack continued, among horrors almost unexampled in the history of war. The Lutherans rejoiced to burn and to defile what all the world had adored. Churches were desecrated, women, even the religious, violated, ambassadors pillaged,

cardinals put to ransom, ecclesiastical dignitaries and ceremonies made a mockery, and the soldiers fought among themselves for the spoil. The population of Rome had been much reduced by the plague of 1522, and a rough census taken shortly before the capture gives the number as about 55,000, of whom 4000 are estimated to have perished in the Sack. All who were able took to flight, and the deserted city was left to the soldiers.

The Duke of Urbino came and looked at the city from without, but decided to do nothing, though the disorder of the imperial troops gave good hopes for an attack, and the Pope at least might have been rescued. In default of all aid Clement made terms. the payment of 400,000 ducats, and the surrender of Ostia, Civita Vecchia, Piacenza, and Modena being stipulated. The Pope was closely guarded in the Castle of St Angelo. While he was helpless there the imperialists occupied Ostia and Civita Vecchia, but were not able to obtain possession of the other places. The Duke of Ferrara seized Modena and Reggio: the Venetians, in spite of their alliance, Ravenna and Cervia. The Papal State was crumbling. From Florence also the Medici nephews were expelled with their guardian, the Cardinal of Cortona. A Republic was established, though the city still adhered to the League. Meanwhile in Rome the Prince of Orange had been forced to relinquish his command, and Lannoy, who took his place soon afterwards, died of the plague, which was raging in the army. For nine months the city and its neighbourhood were at the mercy of the lawless and leaderless troops.

The responsibility of Charles for the Sack of Rome cannot be accurately weighed. That he who wills the act wills also the consequences of the act is a principle that applies to both sides. Charles willed the advance of Bourbon and the armed coercion of the Pope; he willed that the Pope should be deceived by truces, which he did not intend to honour. He could not foresee that Bourbon's army would have been completely out of control, but sooner or later such must have been the case with these Italian armies, among whom destitution was chronic. On the other hand, Clement brought his fate upon himself. He who observes faith with none cannot expect that faith will be observed with him. He who takes the sword must accept what the sword brings. And although an honourable motive, the desire to liberate Italy, and a natural motive, the desire to preserve the real independence of Florence and the papal power, may have partly influenced his actions, it is impossible to acquit Clement of a desire for personal and pontifical aggrandisement, while in the use of means for the accomplishment of these ends he showed neither rectitude, nor practical wisdom. Even in his own game of Italian duplicity he allowed himself to be outwitted.

The Pope and the Papacy were crushed into the dust, but the struggle was not yet over. Before the Sack of Rome, Henry VIII and Francis had concluded a new and offensive alliance at Westminster

(April 30, 1527); and after the news had spread through Europe this was confirmed on May 29, and strengthened still further by Wolsey's mission to Amiens (August). One more great effort was to be made in Italy to force the Emperor to accept two million crowns in lieu of Burgundy, and to release the sons of the French King. The King of England was to give support with money and with men. His zeal was quickened by a desire to liberate the Pope from imperial control, and to bring influence to bear on him for the divorce of Catharine.

In July Lautrec set forth once more from Lyons for the Milanese with an army of 20,000 foot and 900 men-at-arms, to which Italian additions were expected. Advancing by the usual route of Susa, he easily made himself master of the western districts, including Alessandria, and took Pavia by assault. Andrea Doria, the great Genoese sea-captain, who was in himself almost a European Power, came again into the King's service, leaving the Pope, and by his aid the imperialist Adorni were driven from Genoa, and the Fregoso party set up in their place. Teodoro Trivulzio was appointed to govern the city for France. Francesco Sforza was re-established in the chief part of the Milanese. Milan alone under Leyva resisted.

But without completing the conquest of the duchy, Lautrec determined to go south to deliver the Pope. Prospects were favourable, for Ferrara had changed sides again, and Federigo da Gonzaga, Duke of Mantua, abandoning his policy of neutrality, joined the League. But while Lautrec was still approaching, the Pope was forced on November 26 to accept the Emperor's terms, which, except for the promise to convoke a General Council to deal with the Lutheran heresy, chiefly concerned the payment of money, and the grant of ecclesiastical privileges of pecuniary value; but provided against future hostility by the guarantee of Ostia, Civita Vecchia, and Città Castellana, and the surrender of notable Cardinals as hostages. Indeed the Pope, though unlikely to turn again to Francis, who had deserted him in his need, expelled his family from Florence, and was now allied with the Duke of Ferrara. Before the day appointed for his release the Pope was allowed to escape to Orvieto (December 6), his original hostages having been also liberated by the intervention of the Cardinal Pompeo Colonna. He at once set his influence to work to establish a permanent peace. Both monarchs were prepared for peace, but the terms were difficult to arrange. In view of the great expenditure required, whether for the ransom of Burgundy, or for the alternative of war, Francis called together an assembly of Notables (December 16, 1527) to justify the levy of an extraordinary imposition. The Church offered 1,300,000 livres, nobles promised unlimited aid, an offer which they afterwards unwillingly and grudgingly translated into prose; and those who spoke for the towns guaranteed 1,200,000 crowns.

But the terms which were offered to Charles were rejected by him in January, 1528, and war was solemnly declared on behalf of France and

England. Charles in reply reproached Francis with having cowardly broken his knightly word; and offered to sustain his contention with his body. Francis took up the challenge, and asked that time and place should be named. But for one reason or another, this fantastic and frivolous proposal never came to its accomplishment, and it may be doubted if either monarch desired to be taken at his word.

Lautrec was at Bologna when he heard of the liberation of the Pope, and he continued his march through the Romagna, favoured by the secret friendship of Clement. Thence he penetrated through the Abruzzi and advanced upon Apulia. This move drew the imperial army out of Rome, February 17, 1528, which they had sacked once more, and left deserted. Of the forces which had sacked Rome some 11,000 were left; the Prince of Orange had resumed the command, and taken up his position at Troja to protect Naples. Lautrec refused to attack him in this strong position, professing to be waiting for reinforcements, but when the Florentine troops arrived, the Prince of Orange retired towards Naples. Meanwhile the Venetians, as in previous wars, occupied the cities on the Adriatic seaboard. The Prince saw that the utmost he could accomplish was to save Naples. But it was with difficulty that he could collect sufficient provisions for the immediate needs of the troops and city, while Filippino Doria, cruising off the coast, intercepted supplies from Sicily. An attempt made by Moncada to surprise and crush the Genoese commander ended in disaster, with the loss of four galleys, the death of Moncada and of other captains (April 28, 1528), and almost immediately afterwards Lautrec appeared before the walls. Naples was now completely blockaded by the Genoese fleet, soon reinforced by the Venetians, while Lautrec established a siege on land. Meanwhile Henry the younger, Duke of Brunswick, crossed the Alps with a German force, and on June 9 joined Leyva on the Adda, unopposed by the Duke of Urbino; but instead of marching to Naples, Leyva at once proceeded to the reconquest of the duchy, a part of which, including Pavia, he had previously recovered, and Lodi was besieged. But the country was bare of all sustenance, and even when bills arrived there was no one to cash them: so after three weeks the Germans refused to continue the thankless task, and the chief part of them went home. The imperial government in Milan about this time was reduced to such straits that they were driven to impose a ruinous tax on bread to meet their most necessary expenses. French reinforcements were collecting at Asti under the Count of Saint Pol. Never had the prospects of Spain in the Peninsula looked so black. Suddenly, July 4, orders came to Filippino Doria from his uncle Andrea, to withdraw his blockading force from Naples.

Francis had made the great mistake of offending the powerful sea captain. In addition to private slights, Andrea Doria was incensed at the apparent intention of Francis to develop Savona for war and commerce

at the expense of Genoa, and, when he expostulated with the King Francis formed the dangerous design of arresting the captain in his ow city, and put a French commander, without experience, Barbesieux, ove his head. Charles saw his opportunity and, by the advice of the Princ of Orange, he won Doria for his own service, on favourable terms o engagement, and with the promise of liberty for Genoa under imperia protection. In vain, when Francis learnt his danger, he conceded to late everything that Doria had asked. The Admiral's suspicion an resentment had been aroused, and he joined the Emperor once an for all.

This defection changed the whole position of affairs. While th French camp before Naples was ravaged by the plague, abundance suc ceeded to famine in the city. The French fleet under Barbesieux arrive on July 17 bringing a few men, but little real assistance. Lautrec clun desperately to his siege, and endeavoured to collect fresh troops. Th besieged became more and more audacious in their attacks; Dori appeared at Naples with his galleys; and, when on August 16 Lautre died, the situation was hopeless. On August 28 the remnants unde the Marquis of Saluzzo retired to Aversa, where they were obliged t capitulate shortly after. On September 12 Doria entered Genoa, an established a new oligarchical Republic, the French taking refuge in th Castelletto. The form of government then set up persisted, with som modification in 1576, until 1796, and Genoa had internal peace at last In the North Pavia had been retaken by Saint Pol. The French com mander made an effort to recover Genoa, but without success. Th Genoese soon after occupied Savona, and the Castelletto surrendere (October 28). Finally in the spring of 1529 the combined armies o Saint Pol and the Duke of Urbino determined to reduce Milan, not b a siege, but by a combination of posts of observation. This plan unpromising enough in itself, was frustrated by the conduct of Sain Pol, who attempted to surprise Genoa, but allowed himself to be waylai and defeated on his march by Leyva at Landriano (June 20).

Francis and his allies still held some places in the Milanese, an some outlying posts in the kingdom, as well as the cities of the Adriati littoral. But negotiations begun in the winter between Louise of Savo and Margaret, the ruler of the Netherlands, had resulted in a project o peace, which was vehemently desired in the interests of all countries, bu especially of the Netherlands, where public opinion made itself perhap most felt. Charles was meditating a great expedition to Italy under hi personal command, but he consented to treat. He sent full powers an instructions, elastic though precise, to Margaret, who was visited by th King's mother, Louise, at Cambray, July 5. Here the terms of peac were definitely concluded, and the treaty was signed on August 3, 1529 The compact of marriage between Francis and Eleonora was renewed Francis resigned all pretensions to Italy, left his allies in the lurch

ounced his suzerainty over Flanders and Artois, and all the frontier ces on the north-east remained in the hands of the occupant. Robert la Marck and the Duke of Gelders were abandoned. Two millions crowns were to be paid as ransom for the young French princes, and lieu of the present cession of Burgundy, to which Charles reserved right; while the possessions of Bourbon and of the Prince of ange were left to the French King.

With this treaty the first stage in the settlement of the affairs of estern Europe was reached. To Spain was surrendered the unestioned supremacy in Italy, while the territory of France remained ctically undiminished. The agreement seemed stable. Both Powers re thoroughly tired of war. The minor Italian potentates had begun learn that nothing could be gained by war except a change of sters, accompanied by devastation, exaction, plague, and famine. e Pope had made his choice at last. The influence of Giberti, which l always been on the French side, was removed. The moderation ich Charles showed in the use of his success confirmed them in this me of mind. It was his policy, while changing as little as possible in government of the smaller States, to make such order as should ure to him in each effective supervision and control.

The expedition which Charles had prepared for war in Italy set th from Barcelona, after a treaty had been concluded with the Pope ne 29), and in the hope of peace from the negotiations at Cambray. rles may have received the news of peace on his arrival at Genoa, gust 12. With the troops that he brought with him, with the orious force from Naples, the army of Leyva, and fresh German es from the Tyrol, he was absolute master of Italy, and could shape t his will. His dispositions were made at Bologna, whither Clement ne to confer on him the imperial crown.

Peace was made with Venice, who restored all her conquests, and d a war indemnity. Francesco Sforza was restored to Milan: but rles reserved the right to garrison the citadel of Milan, and the town Como, and a Spanish force was left in the Duchy. Florence was ored to the Medici, an operation which required a ten months' siege tober, 1529—August, 1530). Alessandro de' Medici was appointed ead of the government of the city by the decree of October 28, 1530. claim of the Duke of Ferrara to Reggio and Modena was reserved the future decision of Charles. In all other respects the Pope was ored to his full rights, and re-entered on the possession of his poral power, though his status now resembled that of an inferior and ected prince. Malta and Tripoli were given to the Knights of ohn. A league of the powers of Italy was formed, to which finally only the Pope, Venice, Florence, the Marquis of Mantua now created e, but also the Duke of Savoy, and all the minor States adhered.

The Duke of Ferrara was to join when he had been reconciled to the Pope. After all was concluded Charles received at the hands of the Pope the iron crown of Lombardy and the imperial crown, February 23-24, and left Italy for Germany (April, 1530). All the years of war he had spent in Spain, and this was the first time he had visited the ill-fated peninsula, where so much of all that is precious had been expended in supporting and combating his claims. How much had been sacrificed to these ends may best be indicated by noting that the battle of Mohács was fought in 1526, that Ferdinand was elected to the thrones of Bohemia and Hungary in the same year, and that the Diet of Speier and the Siege of Vienna are dated in 1529.

The success of Charles appeared complete and permanent. Far other and even more difficult tasks awaited him beyond the Alps, but so far as Italy was concerned he might sleep secure. He seemed to have brought for once in her troubled history unity to Italy. That so much had been achieved appears at first sight due more to good fortune than good management. Again and again, above all at Pavia and at Naples, luck had declared in his favour when everything seemed to promise disaster. But good fortune seldom comes where it is wholly unmerited. Though always unequal in intellect and resources to the gigantic tasks that were imposed upon him, Charles had shown perseverance almost adequate to his needs. Moreover, the brilliant work of his servants, of Pescara, of Leyva, of Lannoy, of the Prince of Orange, even of the Duke of Bourbon, seems to argue something in this King which enabled him to choose the right men and retain their permanent and devoted service. The fidelity of his Spanish and to a less degree of his German soldiers compares very favourably with the conduct of other ill-paid mercenaries during this period. The Emperor's name might count for much, but men may also well have felt that in serving Charles they were serving one who could always be trusted to do his best, who would never forget or neglect his duties, even though sheer physical incapacity might often leave him far below the level of his conscientious aspiration.

But, not less than the inexhaustible persistency of Charles, the defects of his rivals had contributed to the result. Francis' choice of men was persistently unlucky. Lautrec and Bonnivet compare ill with the leaders of the imperial army. French support was never forthcoming at the crisis. When it came it was ineffectively employed. On the Italian side the leaders and the policy were similarly deficient. After all excuses have been made for the Duke of Urbino he must be judged an unenterprising commander. Giovanni de' Medici, though brilliant as a subordinate, never had a chance to show if he had the capacity to conduct a campaign. The Venetians never dared to push home the resolution on which they had for the moment decided. Clement showed all the characteristics of a man of thought involved in the uncongenial

necessity of prompt, continuous, and definite action. The shadowy figure of Francesco Sforza flits upon the stage and leaves no clear impression.

Some features of the war deserve particular notice. It followed the path of least resistance, and was therefore concentrated on Italy. The invasion of France, of the Netherlands, of Spain, though occasionally attempted, was always fruitless. Germany was never touched, though an attack might have been directed upon Württemberg, and the Habsburg possessions in Alsace. In each of these countries national resistance would be real and vigorous, the population was warlike. Spain was further protected by its inhospitable country, north-east France and the Netherlands by the numerous defensible towns. Italy had no effective feeling of nationality, its inhabitants could fight for others but not for themselves. The immunity of the county and duchy of Burgundy from attack is surprising, but their security was mainly due to the guarantee which the Swiss exacted for their Burgundian friends and neighbours in their French treaty of 1522. Except on this occasion the national action of the Swiss, which for a brief period had decided the fortunes of Italy, 1512-15, does not reappear. They fought as mercenaries, rarely for any national interest, and even as mercenaries their unquestioned military supremacy was past away. The best Spanish foot was probably better; good Germans equally good. Moreover religious differences were beginning to paralyse the Confederation, and the Reformers discouraged foreign service. Savoy and Piedmont were the highway of the French armies, exposed on the other hand to the incursions and requisitions of the imperialists, when they had for the moment the upper hand in Milan. German assistance in men was more than might have been expected, considering the difficulties with which Ferdinand had to contend in the hereditary Habsburg lands. When the war was against the Pope, Lutheran ardour facilitated recruiting. The English alliance, though eagerly sought for, proved of little advantage on any occasion. But the outcome of events in Italy decided the question of Henry's divorce, and with it the defection of England from the papal obedience.

The possession of Milan, on which the struggle chiefly turned, was a luxury to France, a point of vital importance to Charles, so long as he held the kingdoms of Naples and Sicily together with the Netherlands. The continued presence of two first-class Powers in the peninsula was an impossibility. On the other hand, without the defence afforded by the territory and fortresses of Lombardy, Italy was constantly open to invasion, and the value of this barbican was shown in the fact that only once in all these campaigns the kingdom of Naples was seriously threatened, by the invasion of Lautrec. The other consideration, that Milan was the door by which the Spanish forces through Genoa, and the Italian forces from the South, could come to the rescue of the Netherlands

in event of civil war or foreign attack, was not overlooked by Charles and his advisers, but its full significance was not in fact disclosed until the reign of Philip II. On the question of right Charles professed to be fighting for a vassal of the Empire wrongfully deforced; then for an imperial fief forfeited by Sforza's treason; and the restitution of Milan to Sforza shows that the plea of right was not wholly insincere.

We can see that the whole issue of the struggle centred in the question of finance, but unfortunately we are unable to follow the details or draw up any budget of expenses or receipts either for France or the Spanish possessions. During the years from the election to the Empire until the Conference of Bologna, the Netherlands were the chief resource of Charles. Year after year the Estates voted unheard-of subsidies; the total contributions of the Low Countries are estimated for 1520–30 at no less than 15,000,000 *livres tournois*; and though a considerable part of this was consumed in the defence of the provinces, for the necessities of their government, and the maintenance of the Court of the Regent, it was to the Netherlands that Charles looked in the moments of his greatest despair. Castile came next, so soon as the revolt of the *Comuneros* had been crushed. The annual income of Spain may be estimated at about 1,500,000 ducats, in the first years of Charles' reign. The Empire and the hereditary Habsburg lands may for this purpose be neglected.

Money was raised in Castile by pledging the taxes in advance, by issuing *juros* or bonds at fixed interest charged upon the national revenues, by mortgaging to financial houses every possible source of profit. In this way the great House of Fugger took over in 1524 the estates (*maestrazgos*) belonging to the masterships of the three military orders, and later the quicksilver mines of Almaden, and the silver mines of Guadalcanal. The *cruzada*, or revenue from indulgences granted on pretext of a fictitious crusade, became a regular source of revenue, and when, as in the time of Clement, the papal sanction was refused, the King did not scruple to raise it on his own authority, and to pledge it for many years in advance. The fifth on all treasures imported from the Indies was since the conquest of Mexico becoming a valuable supplement, and as an exceptional measure the treasure could be seized and *juros* issued in recompense. But the objection of the Spaniards to the export of treasure from the peninsula made the use of these resources at a distance a very difficult operation, which could only be negotiated by the aid of the most powerful financial houses. From his early years Charles relied greatly on the Fuggers; Genoa from the first, except when it was in French hands, and in the later years of his reign Antwerp, were mainstays of his financial power. Charles was very punctilious in defraying at least the interest if not the capital of his debts, and thus he was at all times able to borrow upon terms. His *juros* were sometimes issued at a price equivalent to a rate of 7½ per cent.: but in times of great

need and danger, when time was the dominant factor, he was obliged to pay as much as 12 and even 16 per cent. for loans. As time went on the revenues of the Netherlands were similarly pledged in advance.

The revenues of the Duchy of Milan in time of peace might have been considerable. In time of war they were whatever the army could raise from the impoverished inhabitants; and before the war was over the state of the country was such that not only was there no superfluous wealth, but the army and the inhabitants alike seemed in a fair way to perish of starvation. The case of Naples and of Sicily was not quite so desperate, in spite of two rather serious risings in Sicily which we have not had occasion to mention. But here a considerable army of occupation had to be kept up and a fleet, if possible, for the protection of the coast, if not from the French and the Genoese, at any rate from the pirates of Algiers. The surplus revenues of the southern kingdoms cannot have been large, and although very often in an emergency Lannoy produced money to content some starving troops or to move some paralysed army, the sums which are mentioned are almost always small, and give but a poor idea of the capacity of the kingdoms to assist their King. Here also the same ruinous policy was pursued as in Castile, of pledging everything in advance, of selling everything that could be sold; and years of peace would be required before the kingdoms could recover.

In Italy another valuable source of occasional revenue was the subsidies raised from the lesser Italian States, which, unless actually at war with the Emperor, could generally be coerced into payment, and, if in his alliance, were expected to contribute handsomely. The Pope was the largest giver, but Venice could sometimes be bled, and Florence, Lucca, Siena, Ferrara, Mantua, were often in a condition which made refusal difficult.

The King of France had a better financial system and was not troubled like the Spanish King by the necessity of consulting his Estates. His entire revenue was somewhat less than the joint revenues of Spain and the Netherlands, but on the other hand he could increase it more rapidly by raising the *taille*, and it was entirely at his disposal; nor was he troubled like Charles by the necessity of difficult financial operations before he could fit out an army. On the other hand, when his army was abroad these obstacles confronted him also. His financial ministers were not conspicuous for honesty, and the institution of the *Trésor de l'Épargne* in 1523, to receive all casual and unexpected sums of revenue and to build up a reserve fund to be at the King's absolute disposal, was not so great a success as was hoped. The deficits during the years of war reached an alarming figure, and it is difficult to see how they were met. For the credit system in France was not developed as it was in Augsburg, Genoa, and Antwerp. The first public loans in France were raised on the security of the revenues of particular towns; and it was not until 1542 that the King began to build up Lyons as a

financial centre to perform for him the same functions that the *bourses* of Genoa and Antwerp were fulfilling for Charles. The attempt had some success, and similar *bourses* were started at Toulouse (1556), and at Rouen (1563). Henry II on his accession acknowledged the debts of his father, and the royal credit sensibly improved. At the outset the King was obliged to pay 16 per cent. for advances, but by 1550 the rate had fallen to 12 per cent. But confidence was rudely shaken when in 1557 the King suspended the payment of interest on the debt, which at that time amounted perhaps to five million crowns.

We can thus get a glimpse of the methods by which the enormous expenses of these and subsequent wars were liquidated. All the spare cash of Europe, withdrawn from commerce and industry, flowed at a crisis into the King's coffers; the road was opened to national bankruptcy, which was general soon after the treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis. Princes had learnt to borrow, but they had not learnt to pay. The sources of wealth were diverted from profitable and useful enterprise to destructive war; and in the long run not even the financiers profited, though in the interval some capitalists built up fortunes, which are almost comparable with those of our own day.

CHAPTER III.

HABSBURG AND VALOIS (II).

After the Treaty of Cambray and the Conference of Bologna the interest of European history shifts its centre to Germany. Charles' efforts in the South were chiefly devoted to the preservation of the existing equilibrium in Italy, to resisting the continuous advance of Muslim power in the Mediterranean, and to the restoration of some degree of prosperity to the shattered homes of Italy. His main attention was centred on the religious question in Germany, and the maintenance of Habsburg power on the Danube. France was still a chronic menace, but the wars were neither so frequent nor so dangerous as they had been from 1522–9. The death of Margaret of Savoy (December 1, 1530) who had governed the Netherlands during Charles' minority (1507–15), and again with intervals from 1517 until her death, made another break with the past. Margaret had been the confidante and intimate adviser of her father Maximilian and, although for a time after his accession in the Netherlands Charles had been estranged from her, he soon discovered her worth, and relied on her as on another self. She was perhaps the most capable woman of her time, well versed in all the arts of politics and diplomacy, a friend of letters and of art, and under her rule the authority of her nephew over the Burgundian States had sensibly increased, though the prosperity of the provinces had not shown a corresponding advance. He was fortunate in finding in the circle of his own family another woman, perhaps less gifted, but well competent to take her place and carry on her policy. His sister Maria, the widow of the unfortunate King of Hungary who fell at Mohacz, was persuaded to undertake the task, for which she had shown her capacity in the troubles which followed the death of her husband Louis, and she entered upon the duties of her office in 1531. Her government was strengthened by the new ordinance establishing three Councils in the Netherlands for foreign affairs, justice, and finance. Shortly before Charles had procured the election of his brother, the Archduke Ferdinand, to the dignity of King of the Romans, and he could therefore regard the relations of his House to Germany and the Netherlands as satisfactorily established.

But his other European concerns gave him grave cause for anxiety. Henry VIII had been brought into marked hostility with Charles by the affair of the divorce. Francis was ever on the look-out for opportunities of reversing the decisions of Cambray. Clement was perplexed by the demand for a General Council; irritated by the appointment of the Cardinal of Colonna, his enemy, as Governor of Naples; and aggrieved by the award of Reggio and Modena to the Duke of Ferrara (April 21, 1531). Charles' earnest desire for joint action against the Turks was thwarted by the scarcely concealed hostility of Francis, and the more secret manœuvring of the Pope. On June 9, 1531, Clement concluded an agreement for the marriage of Catharine de' Medici to Henry, Duke of Orleans, second son of Francis, with secret articles binding the Pope to assist France in the recovery of Milan and Genoa. The German antagonists of Ferdinand were allied with Francis. The formation of the League of Schmalkalden and the renewed advance of Solyman upon Vienna (July, 1532) added further complications, and Charles was in consequence obliged to temporise with the Protestant Powers of Germany (August, 1532). Aid was sent to Ferdinand not only from Germany but from Italy, which for once enabled Ferdinand to meet the enemy in force; Solyman retired and Charles had a respite.

In the autumn of 1532 Charles was again able to visit Italy. Here he found all the States wavering. Venice watched the situation with a cautious eye, well informed of all that was moving in every Court, and ready to take any advantage that offered. Milan groaned under the foreign occupation. Mantua and Ferrara were of doubtful fidelity. In Florence, where the old constitution had been abolished in 1532 in favour of an unmasked autocracy, and in Genoa, where the party of Spinola and Fiesco still were strong, there were powerful political forces working for change. Armed intervention had been necessary at Siena. After a long visit to Mantua, where the famous meeting with Titian took place, Charles met the Pope once more at Bologna (December, 1532). Clement managed to avoid the General Council by imposing impossible conditions; and Charles failed to induce him to give up the projected marriage of Catharine with the Duke of Orleans. All that he could secure was the renewal of a defensive League in which Clement, Milan, Ferrara, Mantua, Genoa, Lucca, Siena, were all included. Venice alone refused to join even this deceptive League. On April 9 Charles left Italy for Spain, where his presence had long been eagerly desired.

The marriage of Henry with Anne Boleyn, declared lawful by Cranmer on May 28, 1533, now threatened a change in the political situation. But Henry was in close alliance with Francis; and Charles was obliged to accept the insult. And although on July 11 the Pope launched against Henry the Bull of Excommunication, which was not however to come into force until October, he was at the same time arranging for a meeting with Francis, and preparing to hand over in person his

niece to the Duke of Orleans. The meeting took place at Marseilles in October, 1533. What matters may have been discussed between these rulers, whether Francis disclosed to the Head of Christendom his projected alliance with the Turks, is unknown, and matters little, for Clement did not live to see any of their plans carried into execution. But the marriage sets the stamp on his policy and marks it as essentially dynastic, not Italian or ecclesiastical. In order to win a doubtful Milan for his niece, he was ready to expose the peninsula once more to the terrors of war, terrors of which he had earned bitter and personal experience.

The death of the Marquis of Montferrat in 1533 and the enfeoffment by Charles of the Duke of Mantua with this frontier State led to hostilities between Saluzzo and Mantua which shook the unstable equipoise of Italy. The news of the conquest of Peru (1532), and the welcome arrival of its treasures, were items to set on the other side. But the relations between the German Protestants and Francis assumed a more dangerous phase in 1534 when the Habsburgs were driven out of Württemberg. In September Francis made proposals to Charles which showed that he was meditating the disturbance of peace. A double marriage was to unite the royal Houses; but Milan, Asti, and Genoa were to return to France, and the Emperor was to give satisfaction to Francis' allies in Germany. The last condition showed that war was inevitable; but Charles determined to gain time by negotiations until a needful piece of work had been accomplished.

For years the western waters of the Mediterranean had been rendered unsafe by a settlement of Muslim pirates on the north coast of Africa, whose head-quarters were at Algiers. In 1518 an expedition from Spain had succeeded in defeating and killing Barbarossa, the founder of this power, but his younger brother, Khair Eddin, who is known as Barbarossa II, had then taken up the command, under the protection of the Porte, and had still further extended the strength and activity of his robber fleets. The settlement by Charles of the Knights of St John at Tripoli and Malta (1530) had been intended to afford a counterpoise to the Muslim, and war had been waged on both sides with piracy and rapine. The dangers of this situation concerned Charles above all others. Not only had Spain a number of possessions dotted along the African coast, but the coasts of Spain, Naples, and Sicily were especially exposed to the raids of the pirate fleets, and their active commerce was endangered. During the Italian wars Charles had neither leisure nor spare energy to attend to this peril; but now immediate measures were not only desirable but possible. The Barbaresques had recently extended their power to Tunis, and in July, 1534, emboldened by the unconcealed favour of Francis, who had concluded with them a commercial truce, they had made a raid of unusual extent upon the Italian coast. Barbarossa had also been named by Solyman as admiral of the

Turkish fleet; and though still a pirate he was the representative of a great Power.

Charles considered that there might just be time for a blow before he was once more paralysed by hostilities with France. The winter of 1534 was spent in preparations, and on May 30, 1535, Charles sailed from Barcelona, and was joined by Doria from Genoa and the galleys of Italy and Sicily. Assistance came from Portugal, from the Knights of Malta, from Venice, and other Italian States, and especially from the new Pope Paul III. The force amounted to 74 galleys, 30 smaller warships, and 300 ships of burden. The attack was directed against Tunis and proved completely successful. Landing at Carthage, the army first won its way into the fortress of Goletta, taking 84 ships and 200 guns, and then after some hesitation advanced upon Tunis, defeated the troops of Barbarossa, and, assisted by the rising of some 5000 Christian slaves, captured the town. The former ruler of Tunis, Muley Hassan, was restored there, the Spaniards retaining Goletta, Bona, and Biserta. Charles returned in triumph to Sicily, though he had not ventured to attack Algiers. The blow was opportune, for a few months later (February, 1536) Francis concluded a treaty with Solyman, with whom he had previously entered into relations in 1525 and 1528. It had another significance, for the Moors of Valencia, after their forcible conversion to Christianity ordered in 1525 and executed in the following years, had been in relations with the Muslim in Africa, and many of them had escaped to swell the bands of Barbarossa.

Meanwhile, on September 25, 1534, Clement had died, nowhere regretted, unless in France. To him more than to any other man is due the success of the Reformation, as a movement antagonistic to Rome. Intent upon dynastic and political interests, he had not only refused persistently to face the question of religion, but he had done as much as any to fetter the only force, except his own, that could have attempted its solution. At his death all England, Denmark, Sweden, part of Switzerland, and the half of Germany, were in revolt; but up to the last the possession of Florence or Milan was of more account in his eyes than the religious interests of all Christendom. The College of Cardinals, immediately on their meeting, came to the almost unanimous choice of Alessandro Farnese, who took the name of Paul III. He soon showed his proclivities by attempting to take Camerino from Francesco Maria della Rovere, the Duke of Urbino, to give it to his own son Pierluigi. But the choice of the Cardinals was grateful to the Emperor, who hoped better things from Farnese than he had ever obtained from Clement, and in particular the summons of a General Council.

The death of Francesco Sforza (November 1, 1535), to whom the Emperor had in 1534 given his niece Christina of Denmark, disturbed the settlement of Milan and threatened the early outbreak of war. Charles seems to have made up his mind to this, for the demands now

made by him on France were provocative rather than conciliatory. He offered the Duchy of Milan not to the Duke of Orleans but to Charles, Duke of Angoulême, with the hand of Christina of Denmark, requiring in return the support of France in the matter of the General Council, against the Turks, and in particular against Barbarossa, for the recognition of Ferdinand's election, for the subjection of Hungary, against Henry VIII, and even in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden. Even Milan was not to be unconditionally given, for the Emperor was to retain the chief places under his own captains and the Duke of Angoulême was to be deposited in his hands. The position of Charles was strengthened on the one hand by the death of his aunt, Queen Catharine, January 7, 1536, and on the other hand by the attitude of the Bavarian Dukes, who for dynastic reasons now turned more definitely to the imperial side. The Pope maintained neutrality, and his help could only be expected for France if the guilt of aggression could be fastened on the Emperor.

The duchy of Savoy, during the campaigns of the first war, had been at the disposal of the French, and opened for them the easiest path to Italy. But the settlement after the Peace of Cambray had brought the weak Duke Charles III into the imperial defensive league, and his marriage with Beatrice of Portugal, in 1521, followed by the marriage of the Emperor with her sister in 1526, formed a permanent link. The first step therefore towards Italy required the subjection or adhesion of Savoy, and the somewhat fanciful claims which the King of France put forward to a part of the ducal inheritance can only be regarded as a cover for attack or a pretext for coercion. Charles III was the weaker at this moment since he had been at war since 1530 with his city of Geneva; and early in the year 1536 his hopes of recovering the town were shattered by an expedition of Bern and the Swiss Protestants, which relieved Geneva and overran the territory of Lausanne and the Pays de Vaud. In March, 1536, the French invaded Savoy, and, in spite of the obstinate resistance of its inhabitants, conquered the whole of Savoy, and occupied Turin. The remainder of the fortified places in Piedmont were seized by order of de Leyva from Milan, to prevent their falling into the hands of the French.

Meanwhile since his landing in Sicily, August 17, 1535, Charles had been devoting his attention to his southern kingdoms. Sicily he now visited for the first time, and he spent ten weeks in considering propositions of reform laid before him by the Parliament, and in inspecting the country. Thence he passed into Italy, leaving Ferrante da Gonzaga as Viceroy in Sicily, and reached Naples on November 25. Here Pedro di Toledo had been Viceroy since 1532, and had given himself to the restoration of order, the improvement of the city, and the re-establishment and extension of the royal power. An attempt which was made to induce Charles to remove him only resulted in strengthening his position, for it soon appeared that the charges against him arose from

the stern impartiality of his administration. At Naples Charles remained four months and a subsidy of a million ducats was voted to him, after a larger offer made in a vainglorious spirit had been wisely refused. That so large a sum could be raised proves the excellent results of Toledo's three years' rule. From Naples Charles proceeded to Rome, learning on his way that the French had attacked Savoy. He had already begun his preparations for defence in Navarre and Roussillon, and now sent urgent orders to assemble troops and collect money.

His presence in Italy, however, was worth an army to his cause. While still in Naples he had succeeded in securing Venice once more for the defensive league, and after his magnificent entry into Rome on April 5, 1536, he could hope that personal influence and concessions to the Pope's family ambitions would secure for him at least the neutrality of Rome. Eager, however, to vindicate his honour, he made before the Consistory and Ambassadors in solemn session a detailed exposition of his case against France and called upon the Pope to decide between them. Paul III declared his intention of remaining neutral, and, yielding at length to long-continued pressure, he issued on May 29 a Bull summoning a General Council to Mantua for May, 1537. The Pope had promised to do his best to reconcile the parties; but as France was determined to accept nothing less than Milan for the Duke of Orleans, and Charles could not, in view of the Dauphin's precarious life, accept his second brother, Henry, whose marriage alliance with the Medici family was another bar, the prospects of successful mediation were poor. But the position in Italy seemed fairly secure; and Henry of England, though he refused an alliance proffered by the Emperor, was too busy at home to cause much anxiety. The contest thus confined itself to France, and Charles, who had collected a great army of 50,000 or 60,000 men, was unwilling to consume it in the unpretending task of reconquering Savoy.

The invasion of Provence seemed likely to secure the evacuation of Savoy, besides the promise of further gain. Accordingly on July 25, 1536, the imperial army, taking advantage of the accession of the Marquis of Saluzzo to the Emperor's side, crossed the French border. But Montmorency, to whom Francis had entrusted the chief command, maintained the strictest defensive. His army was lodged in two fortified camps at Avignon and Valence; the country was systematically devastated; and Charles, though he was able to advance to Aix, found an attack on Marseilles or Arles impracticable. Nothing could be less French and nothing could be more effective than the strategy of Montmorency. On September 13 Charles was obliged to order the retreat.

Meanwhile in the north the Count of Nassau had conquered Guise and undertaken the siege of Peronne. But the war was unpopular in the Netherlands; subsidies were unwillingly granted and the money came in slowly; Peronne held out under the vigorous command of Fleuranges; and at the end of September Nassau also was forced to

retire. In Italy Leyva was dead, and the prospects of the imperial cause were not promising. The little place of Mirandola, whose ruler, Galeotto Pico, had put himself under the protection of France, was a valuable outpost for the French, a base where their troops could find harbour and issue forth to attack the confines of Lombardy. On August 10 the Dauphin had died, and the offer of Milan to Charles of Angoulême assumed a different aspect. Charles while negotiating for peace prepared for war.

For this purpose it was necessary that he should visit Spain to raise the necessary funds, leaving many Italian questions unsettled. The Duke of Mantua received the investiture of Montferrat. Del Guasto was appointed to the command in Milan in place of Leyva. But the attitude of the Pope aroused suspicion; and Charles was obliged to depart without having contented him. On November 17 he left Genoa; but his journey was repeatedly interrupted by storms, while a hostile fleet of French and Turkish galleys lay at Marseilles. At length the fleet was able to make the coast of Catalonia. In Spain many months and continuous efforts resulted in the raising of sums quite insufficient to meet the pressing needs. Francis meanwhile had proclaimed the resumption of the suzerainty over Flanders and Artois, which he had renounced at the Peace of Cambray; and on March 16, 1537, a considerable army invaded Artois. Hesdin surrendered, and Charles of Gelders was once more in arms. But Francis soon grew weary and drew away a large part of his army to the south; the Estates of the Netherlands granted for self-defence the sums which they had refused for general purposes; the attack was driven back; and on July 30 a ten months' armistice was concluded for the Netherlands and north-eastern France.

Meanwhile del Guasto had held his own in Lombardy and even won back some places of Piedmont from the enemy. The Turkish assistance had been worth little to the French. Even in the kingdom of Sicily, owing to the energetic measures of defence, Barbarossa had been able to effect little. The Mediterranean war deviated into a contest between Venice and the Muslim. The remaining islands of the Aegean fell into the hands of the Barbaresques. Nauplia and Monembasia, the sole strongholds of Venice in the Morea, were besieged by the Turks. The murder of Alessandro de' Medici in Florence, January 7, 1537, strengthened rather than weakened the position of Charles in Italy. In spite of the efforts of French agents the imperial vicegerents had their way; the attacks of the *fuorusciti* under Filippo Strozzi, though aided by the French, were driven off; and the cool and competent Cosimo became Duke of Florence in the imperial interests, and was married to a daughter of Toledo. Filippo Strozzi was put to torture and died in prison. Paul was won over by the gift of Alessandro's widow Margaret, the Emperor's natural daughter, to his grandson, Ottavio Farnese, and Pierluigi, the Pope's son, was invested with

Novara. On February 8, 1538, a defensive league against the Turk was concluded between the Pope, the Emperor, Ferdinand, and Venice, which prepared the way for a favourable intervention of the Pope between the two great Powers.

However, in October, 1537, Montmorency with a new army had appeared in Savoy, and the imperial troops were obliged to evacuate Pinerolo and Turin. But these successes led to nothing further. Both monarchs were ready for peace; an armistice was concluded (November, 1537); negotiations began in earnest, but were long prolonged, so many were the questions at issue between the rivals. After the conclusion of the League against the Turks the Pope left Rome, and journeyed to Nice, to mediate between Francis and Charles. Here some ill-feeling was aroused because the Duke of Savoy refused to put the fortress of Nice, his last remaining possession, in Charles' hand for the meetings. In a neighbouring monastery therefore the Emperor and King negotiated personally and separately with the Pope, and a truce was arranged for ten years (June 17, 1538), on the basis of *uti possidetis*. The Pope and Emperor set forth at once for Genoa to concert operations against the Turk.

Although at Nice the King and the Emperor had refused to meet, it soon became known that a future interview had been arranged, perhaps through the mediation of Queen Eleonora. At Aigues-Mortes the visits took place on July 14–16, with the most surprising demonstrations of good feeling. Nothing definite was arranged, but hopes of agreement succeeded to something like despair. And Charles was anxious to make the most of the apparent friendship.

For the Emperor the war of 1536–7 had been on the whole far less successful than those of 1522–9. Francis had overrun almost the whole of Savoy and Piedmont, he had invaded Artois, and successfully repelled two invasions of France. He was content for the present to rest upon his conquests, to hold Savoy, an outpost for defence, a ready road for attack, and to defer the settlement of other outstanding questions for a season. Charles was the more willing to leave Savoy in Francis' possession because the Duke had offended him deeply in the matter of Nice. On the other hand he needed peace above all for his affairs in Germany, and to meet the Turkish danger. A long truce with the appearance of durability suited him as well or better than a peace, which could only have been secured at the price of humiliating and damaging concessions. In fact the two Powers, after violent oscillations to and fro, had reached a position of comparatively stable equilibrium. They had learnt their own limitations, and the strength of their adversaries. A stage was reached on the road to the more permanent settlement of Cateau-Cambrésis.

The truce between the great Powers and the League of 1538 led to

the hope that something serious would now be undertaken against the Turks. But exhaustion, the mutiny of soldiers at Goletta, in Sicily, in Lombardy, a thousand reasons made it impossible for Charles to put out his full strength in 1538. The force that was sent under Andrea Doria to the Levant from Sicily, Naples, Genoa, and Barcelona, to co-operate with the Venetians and a papal squadron, had no orders to undertake any great enterprise. The Venetians desired to attack Prevesa, at the mouth of the Gulf of Arta, where the Turkish fleet was lying, but Doria was unwilling to risk so much on a single encounter; national, urban, and personal jealousies were at work; the League, like other leagues, soon showed its inherent weakness; futile skirmishes were the only result; and the allies soon began to talk of peace. Charles had important business elsewhere, in the Netherlands, in Germany, and the enterprise was put off. After long negotiations, delays, and disappointments, the Venetians made peace with the Turks (October, 1540), surrendering Nauplia and Monembasia.

Not only the affairs of Germany, becoming more and more complicated, but a serious difficulty in the Netherlands contributed to this result. The war of 1536 had necessitated application to the States-General of the Netherlands for a heavy subsidy. All the provinces consented (1537), and in Flanders the three Members Ypres, Bruges, and *le Franc* gave their vote, but Ghent refused; and when Mary declared that the grant of three Members out of four bound also the fourth, and took measures to levy the city's quota, the citizens appealed to Charles, who gave his full support to his vicegerent. After prolonged discontent, at length in 1539 Ghent broke into open rebellion. The government of the town gave way to the pressure of the mob, fortifications were repaired, militia was levied, the subject-cities of Ghent, Alost, Oudenarde, and Courtrai, were drawn into the rising, and Mary was obliged to recognise the revolutionary movement.

At this moment the friendly relations of Charles with France stood him in good stead. Charles had recently lost his beloved wife, Isabella of Portugal, and the French King hoped to engage him in some profitable marriage alliance. He offered a free passage through his States, and Charles, though he refused to hear of any marriage propositions, accepted the offer. Leaving instructions to his son Philip for the event of his death, which show that he would have been willing to allow the whole Burgundian dominions to pass to a French prince as the price of a permanent accommodation, he passed through France, met Francis at Loches (December 12, 1539), and was accompanied by him to Paris. Here he was royally received, and set on his way to Valenciennes, where he met Mary, January 21, 1540. Thence he proceeded to Brussels. The news of his coming, with the assembling of German troops, had quelled the rebellious, irresolute spirits of Ghent, and on February 14 he entered the city without resistance. Its punishment was stern though

not excessive. Nine of the ringleaders were executed. The town, by tearing up the famous calfskin, had declared its own sentence; the constitution was forfeited and an oligarchical government set up. The disputed subsidy and a money indemnity in addition were exacted. The city was deprived of its rights over the surrounding territory and neighbouring towns. A fortress was to be built to prevent rebellion in the future. Solemn submission and humiliation was required. Finally, on these terms the city was pardoned, at the price of all its remaining liberties.

This rapid collapse of a formidable rebellion increased the prestige of Charles very opportunely, for the death of Charles of Gelders in 1538, instead of diminishing his difficulties, had increased them. The Estates of the duchy had at once proceeded to the election of William de la Marck, the heir of Cleves, Berg, and Jülich. The death of his father, Duke John, soon followed (1539), and the union of the four duchies under a prince whose leanings were Protestant was a serious menace to the Habsburg power in the north. Francis I gave Jeanne d'Albret to William of Cleves (treaty of July 17, 1540); which compensated for the rejection of his sister by Henry VIII, announced about the same time. The project of settling matters between Charles and France by one of several alternative marriage schemes had again proved impracticable; and this French alliance with a German prince, an enemy of the Habsburgs, showed a renewal of French hostility; the more so that Charles had hoped that, by a different disposal of Jeanne's hand, the question of Navarre at least might be settled for ever. Charles replied by investing his son Philip (October 11, 1540) with the duchy of Milan.

Affairs in Italy were fairly quiet. The reduction of Camerino by the papal forces (1539), the revolt of Perugia (1540), the refusal of the Viceroy of Naples to allow his forces to co-operate in its repression, and quarrels between Ottavio Farnese and his bride, were not sufficient to disturb the firm foundations on which the Spanish supremacy was built. The rebellion and chastisement of the Colonna were allowed to pass as of purely local importance. It was thought that some of these movements had been instigated to induce the Pope to give effect to the long-promised Council, but the Council, which had been put off time after time, seemed as far distant as ever. The conference at Ratisbon (1541) and the benevolent intervention of Contarini proved of no avail, except to show that the Lutherans would not accept even the decisions of a General Council.

Secure for the time in Italy, and temporising as usual in Germany, Charles thought the moment propitious for another attack on the power of the Barbaresques. When war with France once more became inevitable, the control of the western seas would be valuable; and meanwhile commerce and coast towns urgently required relief. Since 1538 an attempt had been made to win over Barbarossa by way of

negotiation. Charles hoped to secure the corsair for his own servic create for him a vassal kingdom including Tunis, and to turn his a against the Porte. But at the last moment Barbarossa declined proposals, and Charles determined if possible to destroy his power. July, 1541, two French envoys, Antonio Rincon, on his way to C stantinople, and Cesare Fregoso, accredited to Venice, were set u near Pavia and killed by Spanish soldiers. Their papers were secured, but the general nature of their errand was notorious. T delayed the conclusion of a new alliance between France and the Pc and before it could be formed it was necessary if possible to t Algiers. The knowledge of the warlike preparations of the Fre King seemed to make postponement till the new year impossible, although the Diet of Ratisbon, the journey through Italy, an hurried interview with the Pope had brought Charles to September, his most experienced advisers declared that the season was too late, determined to push on his expedition.

It was October 20, 1541, before the fleet which had collected Majorca met the Spanish contingent off Algiers. Heavy weat prevented them from landing for two days, and when at length they w able to put the men on shore the artillery, the supplies, the tents w left on board. A tempest then smote the army, who were at the sa time attacked by the Barbaresques; fourteen galleys, and a hund ships were driven ashore; and Doria was obliged to draw off. The ar had to go now to Cape Matifu, where they took ship again at Bug and with difficulty set sail for their homes, after severe losses, a without any compensating success (November, 1541).

This failure encouraged the French in their long-determined sche of attack. New agents had concluded the arrangements with the Sult and although the Venetians and Lorraine refused to join, the allianc Cleves, with the support of Denmark and Sweden, promised resu though not in Italy. The main objective this time was the Netherlan Antoine, Duke of Vendôme (July, 1542), marched upon Artois a Flanders, hoping for a rising in Ghent and Antwerp. From the side Cleves Martin van Rossem advanced with 18,000 men, and the Duke Orleans with a third army entered Luxemburg. A fourth army ente Roussillon under Francis and invested Perpignan, but the defence Perpignan, under the Duke of Alva, checked any further advance this side. Van Rossem, after devastating Brabant, and threaten Antwerp, joined the Duke of Orleans in Luxemburg, where before lo no place of importance held out excepting Thionville. But the cap cious withdrawal of the Duke of Orleans from Luxemburg with t intention of sharing in the great victory expected for the King in t South, took the heart out of this attack, and the Netherland troo soon recovered Luxemburg except Ivoy and Damvillers In Roussil instead of a victory an ignominious retreat followed.

The following year was threatening for Charles. The Sultan was advancing in force upon Vienna. Barbarossa after devastating the coasts of Italy joined the French fleet under the Duke of Enghien, and laid siege to Nice (August 5, 1543). The city surrendered before long; but the citadel held out, until it was relieved by the approach of del Guasto by land and of Andrea Doria by sea (September 8). Barbarossa returned to winter at Toulon, where throughout the winter Christian slaves were openly sold. Francis on his part invaded Hainault. But Charles, leaving Barcelona for Genoa with the fleet of Doria, arrived in Italy (May, 1543), and, after a hurried interview with the Pope, whose desire for Milan or Siena he was not able to content, continued his journey towards Germany, with a small force of Spaniards and Italians. The Council, already summoned (1542) to Trent, had to be postponed; other things for the moment were more pressing. Ferdinand was left to manage as best he could in the East. At Speier Charles picked up a considerable force of Germans who had assembled to bring aid against the Turks. But Charles led them on with him to Cleves, and attacked Duren. In two days the city was captured by assault. In a fortnight the Duke was at his feet imploring pardon, and on September 7, 1543, a treaty was signed by which the Duke broke off all alliance with France, Denmark, and Sweden, and ceded the duchy of Gelders with the county of Zutphen.

This success fully compensated for the reoccupation of Luxemburg by the French which was completed about the middle of September. Charles moved into Hainault to effect a juncture with the troops which Henry, his ally in this war as he had been in his first, had sent to Calais, and advanced (October 20) to the siege of Landrecies. Francis was in the neighbourhood with a superior army; Charles was anxious to meet him in the field, and advanced in hopes of tempting him to battle. In this he did not succeed, but the retreat of the French army left him with the honours of the campaign.

But the war was not over, and Charles needed all the aid that could be by any means procured. Henry was induced to promise to invade France in the coming spring with an army of 35,000 men. Peace was made with Christian III of Denmark. At the Diet of Speier, 1544, Charles met the German Princes and by extensive concessions secured the neutrality or support of the Protestant Estates. François, Count d'Enghien, had invaded Italy, and advanced to recover Carignano near Turin, which del Guasto had occupied. Del Guasto hurried from Milan to relieve it; and d'Enghien, having received permission to risk a battle, attacked him at Ceresole on April 14, 1544, and completely defeated him, with the loss of some 8000 killed and 2000 prisoners. All Italy began to consider the division of the spoil, but their hopes were vain. The Spanish, holding all the strong places of Lombardy, were enabled to prevent d'Enghien from any further success. Piero Strozzi,

who had collected 10,000 foot at Mirandola, advanced boldly to Milan, in the hopes of joining d'Enghien there, but the Swiss refused to move for want of pay, and Strozzi had to extricate himself as best he could, and the brilliant victory of Ceresole had no results. Still the news of this defeat rendered his success at Speier the more welcome to Charles.

His army under Count William von Fürstenberg now advanced upon Luxemburg and recovered his duchy. The siege of St Dizier was then undertaken; and on July 13 Charles arrived, with 10,000 foot, 2300 horse, and 1600 sappers, to take part in the siege. Here the Prince of Orange was struck by a bullet, and died on the following day, leaving as his heir his more famous cousin, Count William of Nassau. The siege dragged on, while the Dauphin and the Admiral Annebaut with a strong army of observation lay at Jâlons between Épernay and Châlons, and outposts at Vitry harassed the besiegers. But on July 23 these outposts were crushed with considerable loss to the French. On August 17 Sancerre, the captain, surrendered St Dizier with all the honours of war. Charles now advanced on Châlons and, declining to attack the Dauphin's army, pressed on to Château-Thierry and to Soissons (September 12).

If Henry's army had shown equal enterprise the case of France would have been desperate. He arrived on July 15 at Calais with the bulk of his army, and was joined by the Count van Buren with a small force from the Netherlands. Leaving the Duke of Norfolk to besiege Montreuil, he proceeded with his main force to besiege Boulogne. Without aid from him Charles had reached the end of his tether. His relations with the Pope were becoming more and more uncomfortable. Paul had allowed Piero Strozzi to raise troops in his State; the Orsini had been suffered to join him; and the Pope was considering the gift of his grandchild Vittoria to the Duke of Orleans with Parma and Piacenza as her dowry. On the other hand Charles' position for concluding peace was favourable and he seized it. The result was the Peace of Crépy, September 18, 1544. Henry was informed of the terms which Charles was willing to accept; he disapproved of the conditions; but was forced to content himself with Boulogne, which surrendered on September 14.

On both sides the territory occupied since the truce of Nice was to be restored. Francis was to renounce all claims to Naples, Flanders, and Artois; the Emperor did not insist on the restitution of the duchy of Burgundy. The rivals were to co-operate for the restoration of unity in the Church, and against the Turks. Charles was to give to the Duke of Orleans either his eldest daughter with the Burgundian lands, or the second daughter of Ferdinand with Milan. If the Netherlands were given, Charles was to retain the supreme dominion for his life, and Francis was to renounce his rights to Milan and Asti, which were,

however, to revive in case there was no issue of the marriage. If Milan were given the Emperor was to retain effective hold on the duchy until a son was born; and the gift was declared to be a new fief, not dependent on hereditary rights of the House of Orleans. The King in return was to give a handsome appanage to his son in France. As soon as either of these transfers took place Savoy was to be evacuated, and the questions of right between the King and the Duke were to be decided by arbitration. These public conditions were supplemented by a secret treaty, by which the King was required to aid in procuring a General Council, to give help against the German Protestants, and to assist the Emperor to a peace or durable truce with the Turks. The Dauphin shortly afterwards made a solemn protest before witnesses against the treaty as contrary to the fundamental interests of the kingdom. The Pope was left out in the negotiations, although the religious motive is prominent in the conditions. But Paul was obliged to accommodate himself, and to avoid worse he issued a fresh summons to the Council to meet at Trent on March 15 of 1545.

Thus another stage is reached in the settlement of Europe. The war of 1543–5 differs from preceding wars in that the principal effort was directed on the Netherlands, that an attempt was made on both sides to win substantial support in Germany, that Italy was neglected as no longer offering a favourable ground for attack in spite of the possession of Savoy. It resembles the second war in proving that offensive operations on either side, though in this war more extensive and determined, could not lead to any permanent result. The solidity of the several countries was more abundantly demonstrated. The ugly features of this episode are on the one hand the alliance of Francis with the Turk and the corsairs of Barbary, on the other hand the concessions of Charles to the Protestants of Germany, which involved either treason to the Church or the betrayal of his dupes. But some excuse must be made on the ground of the extremity of his need. Charles was a zealous Churchman, but he could not master fate. So long as he was opposed by France and the Ottomans, ill seconded, even thwarted, by the Popes, he could not in addition take upon himself the task of coercing Protestants in Germany. He and he alone of the Princes in Europe formed a just opinion of the religious danger, and did his best to meet it. His desire for ecclesiastical reform was frustrated by the blind opposition of the Popes. Toleration was forced upon him as a political necessity. But to sacrifice the material to the spiritual was a virtue that lay beyond his ken, and one moreover ill suited to the spirit of the age. After all Charles was a temporal prince, and as such his first duty was to the State which he governed.

The Peace of Crépy set Charles free for the first time in his life to intervene effectually in the affairs of Germany. His religious zeal is

attested by the stringent repressive measures which followed in the Netherlands, and the Edict (1544) which called upon all his subjects in the hereditary Habsburg lands to conform to the Confession of Louvain—the acts of a bigot perhaps, but a good man cannot do more than follow his conscience, and Charles was a conscientious Catholic. His first need was to come to an understanding with the Pope. Charles proposed to him definitely the use of the great sums accumulated for a crusade against the Turks in a war against the Protestants, and in support of the Council. At the Diet of Worms (March, 1545) the refusal of the Protestants to be satisfied with a General Council in which the Pope would be both party and judge was openly declared. Charles held himself released from his obligations to the Protestants by this attitude, though indeed the proposed Council at Trent was very different from that which he had promised. But the Pope still hung in the wind. To win him the material must be sacrificed to the spiritual; and the exact nature of the sacrifice was made clear when Paul invested his son Pierluigi with Parma and Piacenza (August, 1545) in spite of the claims of Milan to these districts, and without the imperial sanction. Still the General Council was actually opened at Trent in December, 1545, after many delays and proposals for a removal to an Italian city, which the Emperor emphatically rejected. The choice of Trent was a compromise. Italian cities would attract only Italian clergy, who were too much interested in the abuses of the Curia. German cities would be acceptable only to the Germans. A truce was concluded with the Turks in October, 1545, on very unfavourable terms. The decision of Charles between Milan and the Netherlands as the marriage gift of the Duke of Orleans had at length been made in March, 1545. Milan was to be given with the second daughter of Ferdinand, but the death of the Duke of Orleans in September relieved Charles of this necessity.

Charles was thus free to act in Germany, and, after the futile Religious Conference of Ratisbon (1546) and the so-called Diet which followed, he signed a treaty with the Pope, who pledged himself to send 12,000 men to the support of the Emperor, with a substantial subsidy, and to allow considerable levies from the ecclesiastical resources of Spain (June 22). The Emperor was anxious to keep the terms of the League secret, but the Pope was eager that it should be known, and in letters to the several States he published it at once, exhorting them to join. But the course of the German war aroused once more his fear and suspicions. Only the obstinate resistance of the Emperor had prevented the Pope from removing the Council from Trent to some town where he could more effectively control all its proceedings. Many differences had arisen over the policy to be observed with reference to the Council, the Pope sent his troops, though not the full number, and the 200,000 crowns which he had promised did not arrive; difficulties were raised with regard to the pledging of Church lands in Spain. The Emperor was obliged to

raise money by an agreement with the southern cities of Germany, promising them religious liberty. In January, 1547, the Pope withdrew his contingent, the six months for which he had promised it having expired. He was intriguing with the French. In March, 1547, the Council was removed to Bologna, and the Spanish Bishops refused to follow, while Charles refused to recognise a Council at Bologna. The victory of Mühlberg, April 23, 1547, made Charles' position still more formidable. An actual rupture between the Pope and the Emperor seemed probable, suggested not only by fear of Charles' exorbitant position in Europe, but by minor Italian interests.

The solidity of Spanish power in the Italian peninsula was apparent especially at this juncture. Ferrante de Gonzaga, who had been named as Governor of Milan in 1546, though the appointment proved unfortunate, secured at least the support of Mantua. The Venetian policy grew more and more cautious, and the greater this caution the greater the difficulty of disturbing existing arrangements. The policy of Ercole II of Ferrara was almost equally prudent. Cosimo de' Medici showed himself the faithful servant of Charles, and in view of his watchful guardianship troubles at Lucca and Siena might pass almost unnoticed. Naples was in the firm hands of Toledo. Doria seemed safe at Genoa, and could be absolutely trusted. Only the Pope showed inclinations to disturb the settled order, in the interests of his greedy Farnese family. And so long as the other factors remained unchanged he was powerless for serious harm. But in Italy revolutions were always possible.

The remarkable enterprise of Francesco Burlamacchi directed from Lucca against Florence with the aid of the Strozzi failed miserably (1546). A more dangerous conspiracy was set on foot in Genoa by Gianluigi Fiesco. Gianluigi, moved by the loss of his own property, jealous of the power of the Doria, and taking advantage of the discontent of the people with the constitution of 1528, which gave all the power to the old nobility, had long since entered into relations with France for the overthrow of the Doria, and the Spanish power resting upon them. The possession of Genoa was the key to the peninsula, and the wealth of the Genoese capitalists a mainstay of Charles. On the other hand the immense debts owed by Charles to the Ligurian financiers secured for him the support of the moneyed interest, but could hardly prevent a sudden stroke of force. The Pope allowed Fiesco to arrange for the purchase of four of his own galleys, at that time lying in Civita Vecchia (1546). The Pope's relations with Doria were far from friendly, apart from any animus against the Emperor.

The time fixed for the attempt was the night of January 2, 1547. At ten o'clock the conspirators, who had a galley and 300 foot-soldiers at their disposal, issued from the palace of Fiesco in three bands. Fiesco himself with one made for Doria's galleys, seized them, and in the

attempt to prevent the liberation of the galley-slaves fell overboard and was drowned. The two other bands made for two of the gates of the city, and at the noise of the tumult, Giannettino, the adopted son of Andrea Doria, came up and was promptly killed. Andrea, however, escaped with his life, and when the conspirators looked upon their work in the morning they discovered that their own chief was missing. Left thus without unity or direction they wavered; the Senators offered them an amnesty on condition that they left the city; and the formidable plot resulted in nothing but the re-establishment of Doria and his master. The amnesty was revoked; the possessions of the conspirators were confiscated; but Doria succeeded in repelling proposals for the reduction of Genoa under direct Spanish rule, and for the erection of a fortress. Certain alterations were made in the constitution for the purpose of securing authority to the partisans of Doria, but Genoa retained at least the forms of liberty. The Castle of Montobbio, the sole remaining possession of the Fieschi, became a danger for a while; but surrendered to the forces of the Republic on June 11, 1547; and Doria succeeded in suppressing other plots instigated by Francesco and Pierluigi Farnese.

The removal of the Council from Trent came a little too soon for Charles, and it would have been impossible for him at that moment to follow the radical counsel of Cosimo de' Medici (February 6, 1547), who advised him to use his power for a complete reform of the Church through the Council, taking away the tyranny of priests, reducing the power of the Pope to its proper spiritual limits, and restoring the pure faith of Christ without the abuses that had grown up about it. Charles was powerless to prevent the removal of the Council, though its subsequent adjournment was a concession to him. The gulf between Emperor and Pope widened; but neither of them was anxious for an open rupture. Henry VIII had died on January 28, and Francis I on March 31, 1547; and the whole scheme of European policy was likely to undergo revision. The Pope would not move until he was sure of support; and Charles was too busy in Germany to wish to provoke complications in the peninsula. Henry II of France showed friendly inclinations towards Paul, but gave him no more definite assurance of friendship than a promise of the hand of his natural daughter for Orazio Farnese. From England under Somerset nothing was to be hoped. The negotiations of the Pope with Charles still turned on the investiture of Parma and Piacenza, and the addition of Siena, as much as upon the question of the Council. Charles was determined that no session should be held at Bologna; and although the Pope had set out to preside over a solemn session intended as preparatory to the close of the Council, Diego de Mendoza, the Emperor's envoy, had succeeded in procuring a further postponement, when a series of unexpected events changed the whole situation. The aspect of Naples and Siena was threatening, but the cloud burst in Piacenza.

The progress of heretical opinions in Naples was notorious; and in

May Paul had sent a commissary to the kingdom, with a brief which hinted at the establishment of the Inquisition. A rebellion at once followed; and the small Spanish garrison was in difficulties. But the prompt and judicious measures of Toledo, and the assurance of Charles himself that he had no intention of introducing the Inquisition or of allowing it to be introduced, soon restored order; yet an uneasy feeling remained that the brief had been sent with the secret intention of provoking revolt. Siena had already in 1545 risen in arms against the imperial commissioner, Juan de Luna, and the *Monte dei Nove*, whom he supported, and had driven out the Spanish garrison. Cosimo succeeded in preventing any great excesses, but Francesco Grassi, whom Charles sent from Milan to appease discontent, failed to effect a compromise. The citizens took up arms again and accepted the protection of the Pope, protesting against any foreign garrison, and excluding the *Noveschi* from any share in the government. Cosimo, however, succeeded in procuring the acceptance of his own mediation, and on September 28 a garrison of Spaniards was admitted. Mendoza arrived in October, restored the *Noveschi*, and set up as before a governing body of forty, ten from each *Monte*, but insisted on naming the half of them himself (November, 1548).

In Piacenza the rule of Pierluigi Farnese was hated. His measures for reducing the nobility to obedience, by depriving them of their privileges and forcing them to live in the city, though salutary, made him many enemies. Private wrongs increased their number. Gonzaga, who represented the forward policy in Italy, was anxious to take advantage of the troubles at Genoa and Siena to establish direct Spanish rule over those cities, and the discontent at Piacenza was much to his mind. Aware of the hostile movements directed against him, and of the support given by Gonzaga from Milan to his assailants, Pierluigi prepared to defend himself by the building of a fortress at Piacenza. This accelerated the blow which had been long prepared by Gonzaga. On September 10, 1547, the conspirators took up arms; Pierluigi was killed in his palace; and the city was in the power of the rebels. Gonzaga's promptitude is a sufficient proof of his complicity. On the 12th he entered the city, and occupied it in the name of Spain. Of the projects of his minister Charles had been sufficiently informed, and, although he had counselled prudence, he had not discouraged the enterprise. It was an act of open war against the Pope, wounding him where he was most sensitive. Charles de Guise, the newly elected Cardinal, appeared at Rome in October, and this seemed to give the Pope his opportunity of revenge. Conditions for a league with France were drawn up; Parma and Piacenza were to be given to Orazio Farnese, not to Ottavio, the Emperor's son-in-law; the King was to supply troops for the defence of the Papal States; French bishops were to attend the Council at Bologna; the Pope was to contribute 7000 men, if the King was to be attacked in his

own States. The projected league like many others, though ostensibly defensive, was really intended for offence.

The Diet of Augsburg (1547) gave Charles a lever in his negotiations. He was able to offer the submission of all Germany to the Council as a price for its return to Trent. But the Pope referred the decision to the Fathers at Bologna, who decided in favour of that city. Charles could do nothing but enter a solemn protest before the assembly at Bologna and in the Consistory (January, 1548); and the Spanish Bishops remained at Trent. Negotiations continued while the Council remained in effect suspended. Threats made by the Pope of an attack upon Naples came to nothing, and a fresh plot conducted by Giulio Cibò against Genoa failed. On the other hand Henry II was not satisfied with the terms of the league offered by the Pope. Meanwhile France was arming; the Pope was arming; and Charles put his possessions in a state of defence. Cosimo de' Medici occupied Elba and Piombino for the further defence of his coasts in the imperial interest. The remonstrances, however, of the Genoese, who feared an attack upon Corsica, led Charles to take these places into his own hands. The visit of Henry II to Savoy and Piedmont (May, 1548) proved to be no more than a reconnaissance in force and led only to the seizure of the Marquisate of Saluzzo. Further delay was caused by the French war with England which broke out in 1548 over the Scottish question, and the Pope's revenge had to be postponed. The *Interim* (May, 1548) agrees with the tone of general European politics at the time. Every Power was seeking to enjoy the benefits of time, and in such a policy Charles was a master.

And so the stormy year 1547 passed into the sullen peace of 1548, while the Pope was still offering ecclesiastical concessions as the price for the restitution of Piacenza, and Charles replied by asserting his right not only to Piacenza but to Parma also. Gonzaga continued to push his adventurous plans upon the Emperor, and hoped to take advantage of the passage of the Archduke Philip through Northern Italy in the autumn of 1548, at least to secure the building of a castle in Genoa; but nothing could be done except by force, and the Emperor was above all anxious to preserve the existing equipoise, as is shown by his instructions to Philip, written in February, 1548. With Gonzaga was co-operating Mendoza, he increased his personal authority over Siena, disarmed the citizens, and finally proposed the erection of a castle. The Pope proceeded with his negotiations with France, and although he allowed certain ecclesiastical concessions to be extorted from him, nothing certain resulted. The affairs of the Council became more and more desperate; and finally, in September, 1549, the order came to suspend it. The proposal to give Parma to Orazio Farnese or to incorporate it with the domains of the Church had alienated Ottavio; who, after a futile attempt to seize the city, took refuge with Gonzaga.

Paul III died on November 10, 1549, his last days embittered by dissension with his family, whose advancement had been his chief thought, and for whom he had sacrificed the friendship of the Emperor and the interests of the Church. His last act was to sign an order to place Parma in Ottavio's hands; but the Orsini, who were holding the town, refused compliance.

The Conclave which followed was unusually prolonged. The imperial party, with whom the Farnese party made common cause in the hopes of winning Parma at least, if not Piacenza, for the family, were in a majority, and aimed at the election of Pole or the Cardinal Juan de Toledo, both known to be well disposed towards ecclesiastical reform. But the French party, though not able to elect any of their own candidates, were fully able to prevent the election of any other; and, after the Conclave had lasted more than two months, the two parties agreed to elect the Cardinal del Monte, who took the name of Julius III (February 7, 1550). Although his sympathies on the whole had been French, although he had been associated with the removal of the Council to Bologna, although he had the reputation of frivolity and vice, the imperial party accepted him as likely to choose tranquillity rather than war and intrigue. Tranquillity meant the continued domination of Spain. His good disposition towards the Emperor soon became evident in a number of matters, trifling in themselves, but important in the aggregate. More important still was the intention which he soon announced of reopening the Council at Trent. In fact, on November 14, 1550, he published a Bull summoning the Council to meet at Trent in the following May, notwithstanding the opposition of France, and the impossibility of settling the conditions in accordance with the wishes of the Emperor, the demands of the German Diets, and the interests of the Curia.

Julius had restored Ottavio Farnese to Parma in fulfilment of promises made in the Conclave, but he could not effectually protect him against the hostilities of Gonzaga from Milan. Nor could he persuade Charles to restore to his son-in-law Piacenza also. On the contrary the pressure of Gonzaga on the borders of Parma and his intrigues within the Duchy drove Farnese to apply for aid from France (December, 1550). Terms were arranged with France and Ottavio passed into the service of Henry. The King assembled troops at Mirandola. The Emperor pressed for a sentence of confiscation against Ottavio, and offered a loan to enable Julius to carry it out. Gonzaga seized Brescello (to the north-east of Parma) from the Cardinal d'Este. The Pope hesitated, but finally decided that it was more dangerous to offend the Emperor, and (May, 1551) declared Ottavio deprived of his fief. It then became necessary to resort to force, and Giambattista del Monte, the Pope's nephew in command of the papal troops, received orders to co-operate with Gonzaga in the occupation of the Parmesan (June).

The war opened badly. On his way to join Gonzaga Giambattista suffered a slight reverse. Bolognese territory was attacked by the Farnesi, and the safety of Bologna itself was doubtful. The Pope was anxious to protect Bologna and called off the chief part of his troops for its defence. Reinforcements reached Parma from Mirandola. Although Mirandola was under French protection it became necessary to attack it, and the double enterprise against Parma and Mirandola proved too much for the scanty forces. The country was ruined but nothing was effected. War had not yet opened between the French King and the Emperor, but the peace concluded with England by Henry II (March 24, 1550), by which Boulogne was restored for a money payment, left him free on that side; and he could choose his own moment for overt hostilities.

Meanwhile the truce between Charles and the Sultan had been broken. A new corsair, Dragut, had established himself on the Tunisian coast of Africa at Mehedia, known as the Port of Africa. His ravages on the neighbouring littoral of Sicily and further afield had rendered action imperative; and in September, 1550, the united fleet of Charles' dominions had attacked and captured his headquarters, though his fleet escaped on this occasion, and again from Doria's blockade in the following spring. Charles could represent that this act of reprisal had been abundantly provoked, but the Sultan had made Dragut his commissioner to rule over the whole of Barbary, and regarded the attack upon him as an attack upon himself. On his return from an expedition against the Sophy of Persia, which the truce with Charles had permitted, the Sultan prepared for war. In July, 1551, a great Turkish fleet appeared in Sicilian waters, and after vainly demanding the restoration of Mehedia, the Ottomans turned upon the Knights of St John, and captured Tripoli (August 14). In September of the same year the Turkish war began afresh in Hungary. Once more Charles had to withstand the simultaneous hostility of the Most Christian King and of the infidels. In the course of 1551 Henry was submitting plans for common action to the Porte, and the use of the Turkish fleet was recommended; war in Hungary being calculated to unite the Germans in defence. The King of France was also in relations with Magdeburg and with Maurice of Saxony.

Under these auspices the Council met once more at Trent in May, 1551, though it was autumn before formal proceedings could be begun. Its prospects were not rosy, for in September, 1551, war opened on the side of Savoy. Although François de Brissac, the French commander, did not push his attack, the necessity of action in two distant fields completely disorganised the imperial finances in Italy. The blockades of Parma and Mirandola were in consequence slackly pursued; the Pope saw little prospect of gain from the war; his debts were burdensome; French hostility threatened him with the failure of French funds; he began to think whether an arrangement with France was not possible.

In April, 1552, he concluded a truce with France, which allowed Ottavio Farnese to hold Parma unmolested for two years. About the same time the Pope's nephew, Giambattista, died in action. Charles was fain to accept the truce, for the same reason which mainly influenced the final decision of the Pope; the rising of Maurice of Saxony in alliance with the French, and the news of a French invasion. A fresh advance of the Turks in September, 1551, was another of the intolerable burdens which Charles had to bear at this, the darkest moment of his life.

The alliance between Henry II of France and the Protestant Princes of Germany was concluded at Chambord on January 15, 1552. It opened the way for a new development of French policy, the acquisition of territory, not Burgundian, at the expense of the Empire. On March 13, 1552, Henry invaded Lorraine, took the government from the Duchess and her infant son, and, in accordance with his agreement with the Protestant princes, occupied the principal towns of the three great bishoprics of Toul, Metz, and Verdun.

Since the accession of René de Vaudemont the power of the Dukes had been consolidated in the Duchy of Lorraine, by the extension of their influence over the Bishoprics, and the election of relations or partisans to the several Sees. But the policy of the duchy in the wars between France and Burgundy had been to preserve neutrality as far as possible; and thus up to this time immunity had been secured. The marriage of Christina, the Emperor's niece, to the heir of Lorraine in 1540 had not during the life of her husband disturbed this neutrality; but Christina had been recently left a widow, and her regency in the duchy gave a plausible excuse for French intervention. Lorraine was easily subdued, but an attempt to seize Strassburg failed. The Netherland forces created a diversion by invading France and devastating Champagne; and Henry replied by marching on Luxemburg and occupying the southern part of the duchy.

The Emperor had hoped before the crisis arrived in Germany to reach the Netherlands, but his way was barred by the confederates; in Innsbruck he was not safe, and he was a fugitive at Villach in Carinthia, while the French worked their will in Lorraine and Luxemburg. But in August, 1552, after the confederates had been brought to terms, he issued once more with an army, and passing through Southern Germany, was well received at Strassburg, which had refused to admit the French. Thence notwithstanding the lateness of the season he proceeded to the siege of Metz, which meanwhile had been strongly fortified by François, Duc de Guise, and was ready to hold out. In spite of Charles' discreditable alliance with Margrave Albert Alcibiades of Brandenburg-Culmbach the siege, which did not begin until October, proved a complete failure, and on January 1, 1553, Charles had to order a retreat. These events had their reaction on the Council of Trent, which was suspended in April, 1552, for two years or until the troubles should be overpast.

That no more general rising took place in Italy during the months when Charles was suffering the invasion of Lorraine, and afterwards flying from Innsbruck before his enemies, is a remarkable testimony to the solidity of the edifice which he had built up. Charles contributed indeed to this result by abandoning the forward policy and its agents. Mendoza was recalled, and Gonzaga was removed from the government of Milan. There were not wanting centres of disaffection. Ferrara was French, even Cosimo wavered, Siena, irritated by the castle which Charles was building outside the walls by the advice of Mendoza, burst into open rebellion (July 17, 1552); but Cosimo was able to isolate the conflagration, and although the Spanish garrison was driven out and the fortress levelled the rebellion did not spread. It was agreed that Siena should remain free under imperial protection, and foreign forces should be excluded. Nevertheless French troops garrisoned the city, the fortifications were strengthened, and the Cardinal of Ferrara assumed the government in the French interest. The Spanish government had to acquiesce for the present and wait for its time to come. An attempt in January, 1553, to subdue the city by force from Naples failed owing to the death of Toledo, and the recall of his son, who was commanding the army.

In 1554, however, Cosimo gave the word for more energetic action. Piero Strozzi, the ubiquitous opponent of Medici and Habsburg, had entered the city in January. During his temporary absence Florentine troops surprised a gate of the city. Nevertheless Siena held out for fifteen months, the besieging army being commanded by that successful adventurer, Gian Giacomo Medichino, Marquis of Marignano; while Blaise de Montluc governed the city for the French King and Strozzi showed great ability and resource in frequent raids and sallies. But Strozzi's total defeat at Marciano on August 2, 1554, rendered it possible to complete the blockade, and in April, 1555, the city surrendered to famine. The irreconcilables held out for four years longer at Montalcino, but the issue was no longer doubtful. The city was given up by Philip to Cosimo (1557), and incorporated in his duchy of Tuscany. The Spaniards retained, however, the coast towns (the *Presidi*). Piombino and Elba Cosimo had already received. So ended the last of the old-fashioned revolutions of Italy, and one more single and independent city was incorporated in the larger system. Cosimo was a main link in the Italian scheme of Charles, and the accessions of territory which he received were well earned by his services to the Habsburg cause.

Meanwhile the French and Turkish fleets had been co-operating in the Mediterranean, raiding the Italian coasts They then provoked a rebellion in Corsica, which at first had considerable success, but ultimately with Spanish and German aid the Genoese recovered the principal fortresses, and the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis restored the island to Genoa.

The war on the French frontier continued its indecisive course. In

June, 1553, Charles had his first success. Terouanne was attacked in April, and after two months capitulated with its garrison of 3000 men, and Montmorency's eldest son. Emmanuel Philibert, who in this same year succeeded his father as Duke of Savoy, took and destroyed Hesdin. Robert de la Marck, whose hostilities had first involved the Emperor in war (1522), was a captive. An attack on Cambray by the French King failed. In the following year the French changed their objective to the valley of the Meuse, capturing Marienburg, Dinant, and Bouvines. To resist them two new fortresses, Charlemont and Philippeville, were built on the territory of Liége. The defence of Namur by Charles in person ended his fighting days with credit. Almost his last act of authority was to conclude the short-lived Truce of Vaucelles (February 5, 1556).

The close of Charles' career is characteristic. A long campaign against odds in which reverses were fully compensated by success; the marriage of Philip with Mary of England (July 25, 1554), conceived in the true Habsburg spirit; the completion and final consolidation of his work in Italy; the Religious Peace of Augsburg, in which Charles was forced by political necessity to acquiesce, against his will and against his convictions. His work was done. During forty years he had striven to discharge the impossible tasks imposed upon him by accident and a mistaken dynastic policy. He had now accomplished what he could perform. The duchy of Milan and preponderance in Italy was a set-off for the lost duchy of Burgundy. The conquest of Lorraine he could regard as a wrong done not to himself but to others. The acquisition of this duchy would have tempted him had he resembled his ancestor Charles the Bold. It does not however appear that he ever contemplated such a conquest, a proof of his essentially conservative policy. He had given peace to Italy, if not to Germany; at the price of much that was valuable, much that could never be restored, but still he had given peace. The accession of Paul IV (May 23, 1555) gave reason to believe that this peace might be disturbed; but its ultimate restoration could be confidently expected. The late war had shown the strong defensive position in Italy and the Netherlands; a position so strong that the main French attack had been diverted from Charles' hereditary possessions to the neighbouring independent and weaker powers. Spain as usual was regarded as inexpugnable. With the Reformation alone he had proved unable to cope. It was an accomplished fact, but he had given it bounds, and extinguished in Germany religious war.

The question of Savoy still remained unsolved, but this he could leave to his son to settle. So long as France still held Savoy and Piedmont she held the gates of Italy; and Spanish garrisons in Milan had to be maintained almost at war-strength. But something must be left undone; and Charles had the right to demand his release. Although he was still young, as we measure youth, his incessant labours had destroyed his health. He was racked with gout, the penalty of his

voracious appetite and unsparing industry. His abdication, although it has often been regarded with surprise, was the most natural act, and the moment for it well chosen. In the Netherlands it was accompanied by a touching and impressive ceremony (October 25, 1555), when, in the midst of a splendid assembly at Brussels, the Emperor with tears explained his reasons, recounted his labours, and gave his last exhortation; and then solemnly invested his son with his Northern provinces. Milan and Naples had been previously handed over. On January 16, 1556, Charles resigned his Spanish kingdoms and Sicily. Shortly afterwards he gave up the Franche-Comté. He made over to his brother all his imperial authority, though his formal renunciation of the Empire was not accomplished until 1558. Free at last he set sail for Spain (September 17, 1556) and made his way to the monastery at Yuste. Here he took a constant interest in the political affairs of the time, and occasionally intervened by way of advice and influence. After two years of rest, broken by increasing infirmity, he closed his life in 1558; too soon to see the seal set upon his labours by the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis.

Julius III had concluded on March 24, 1555, his insignificant career; Marcellus II, his successor, died on April 30; and on May 23 Giampiero Caraffa was elected, and took the title of Paul IV. The ecclesiastical activity of Caraffa, his share in the endeavour to restore pontifical and hierarchical authority in the years previous to his election as Pope, his religious attitude and tendencies do not concern us here. But the spirit shown by Caraffa in the treatment of heretics, and the affairs of the Church, promised little peace if it were to be applied to the complicated political relations of the papal see. What all expected to see was an uncompromising postponement of political expediency to the single object of restoring papal supremacy and ecclesiastical unity. What none could have foreseen was that not only the political interests of the Holy See but also all chances of an effective Catholic reaction were to be sacrificed to the demands of intense personal hatred.

It was known that Caraffa was an enemy of Spain. As a Neapolitan, he detested the alien masters of his native country. In 1547 he had urged upon Paul III an attack on Naples in support of the rising which had then occurred in the kingdom; and it had subsequently required all the influence of Julius to procure his admission to the Archbishopric of Naples. But the overmastering nature of his hatred was not known, and is even now not completely to be explained. If we assume that personal grounds of animosity co-operated with intense hatred of foreign rule, a despairing sense that one last blow must be struck to free the Papacy once and for all from Spanish domination, and a stern conscientious antipathy to those methods of compromise with heretics which had been the chief mark of Charles' action in religious matters—if we assume that all these feelings worked together, each intensifying and exacerbating

the other, then we can perhaps begin to understand the attitude of Paul. In addition his advanced age (he was 79 years old at the time of his election) admitted of no delay; what was to be done must be done quickly; and the history of the Papacy can prove that old age exercises no mitigating influence over the passions of anger and hatred.

The forces with which Paul entered on this struggle were in themselves insignificant. The total gross revenues of the Papal State about this time are estimated at 1,000,000 crowns; from which sum 400,000 crowns must be at once deducted for taxation remitted by Caraffa and necessary current expenses. The ecclesiastical revenues had been reduced by the apostasy of Germany, the practical independence of Spain, the condition of England, and by the austere refusal of the Pope himself to allow money to be raised by questionable means employed in the past. The papal troops were inefficient even if judged by an Italian standard; the population was neither prosperous nor devoted; and there were permanent centres of sedition and opposition.

Paul set himself at once to gain external help. Ferrara joined; a league was concluded at Rome with France, which was represented by Charles de Guise, the Cardinal of Lorraine, December 16, 1555; but Venice as usual maintained a watchful neutrality. But his policy of enriching his nephews by confiscation of the goods of Roman nobles, while it agreed ill with the zeal for reform and justice hitherto professed by the Pope, gained him many enemies at home. The conclusion of the Truce of Vaucelles (February, 1556) was a disappointment to Paul; but his able and unscrupulous nephew, Cardinal Carlo Caraffa, succeeded during the summer in persuading Henry II to renew the league for defensive purposes. The seizure and imprisonment of Garcilasso della Vega, the secretary of the Spanish embassy at Rome, was a measure of open hostility; and the Duke of Alva, who had succeeded Toledo at Naples, was forced to address a remonstrance, almost an ultimatum, to the Pope in August, 1556. No satisfaction was to be expected; and in September the Spanish troops crossed the frontier and began to occupy the Campagna. The Pope, ill prepared for war, was forced to beg for an armistice, which was granted (December 2, 1556). He used the interval to call on his ally for help; and before the month was out the Duke of Guise crossed the Alps. Instead of allowing him to proceed to the reduction of Milan, Paul insisted on his pressing on through papal territory to Naples. The passage of the French troops increased the discontent of the papal subjects in Romagna and the Marches, which had already been aroused by the extraordinary subsidies required for the war. The papal troops were melting away for want of pay; and when the allied armies crossed the Neapolitan frontier and laid siege to Civitella, they were soon compelled to withdraw. In August, 1557, the news of the battle of St Quentin caused the recall of Guise, and the Pope was left without defence.

Alva could easily have taken Rome if he had wished, but neither he nor his master wished to reduce the Pope to extremities. The Pope was forced to beg for peace, which was granted on easy terms. The only serious concession required was the restoration to the Colonna and other friends of Spain of the property which had been taken from them and conferred upon the papal nephews. The Spanish hegemony in the peninsula stood firmer than ever, but the Papal State was not curtailed. Alva visited Paul at Rome, and was reconciled to the Pope (September, 1557).

After this brief and fruitless exposition of hatred, Paul returned rebuked to his work of ecclesiastical reformation and the stimulation of the Inquisition. That action of the Inquisition was frequently directed by political motives was generally believed at the time, and is not in itself improbable. Partly to quell the resentment caused by this and other measures, partly perhaps to indicate the recognition and abandonment of a mistaken policy, Paul (January, 1559) deprived his nephews of all their offices and banished them from Rome. This act of justice was however only the preliminary to the enforcement of still sterner measures of religious repression, and when the Pope expired in August, 1559, it was amid scenes of wild disorder; the head-quarters of the Holy Office at Rome were stormed and wrecked; the Pope's statue was destroyed and dragged with ignominy through the streets. His ecclesiastical policy appeared to be as complete a failure as his attack upon the power of Spain.

But indirectly the action of Paul had a permanent effect on the history of Europe. It led to the rupture of the Truce of Vaucelles. The conclusion of this truce had seemed to be a triumph for Montmorency; but Cardinal Caraffa and the influence of Guise secured the real triumph for the party of Lorraine. Soon after the expedition of Guise to the peninsula war broke out in the North of France, but both sides confined themselves for some time to preparations and defensive measures. On June 7, 1557, Mary of England declared war on France. At length, in July the army of the Netherlands under Emmanuel Philibert began to move, and laid siege first to Guise and then to St Quentin. Coligny succeeded in throwing himself into this place, and animated its defence; but when Montmorency attempted to relieve the fortress (August 10) he was attacked and severely defeated. The Constable himself, with many of the greatest men of France, was taken prisoner. The only French army in the north was scattered, and the way lay open to Paris. But Philip refused to allow the advance, and the French were given time to assemble troops and put their defences in order. Coligny's obstinate defence in St Quentin gave seventeen days of respite after the battle; and Guise was recalled from Italy. Philip occupied a few trifling fortresses and then disbanded his army.

In November Guise, whose authority with the King was now no

longer contested by the conflicting influence of Montmorency, had brought together an army; and on January 1, 1558, the siege of Calais was undertaken; in eight days the town surrendered, and the English were expelled. Guines was captured shortly afterwards, and this gate of France was closed for ever to the English. But the French need was extreme. While the siege of Calais was proceeding the notables of France assembled in Paris at the King's command, and Henry demanded of them a loan of 3,000,000 crowns, one-third from the clergy, two-thirds from the towns. The news of the capture of Calais caused the proposition to be accepted with acclamation. In April the marriage of the Dauphin to Mary of Scotland, with the secret agreements concluded previously, opened other prospects to French foreign policy.

In May, however, negotiations for peace were begun by the Cardinal of Lorraine, and Antoine de Granvelle, Bishop of Arras, suggested the alliance of France and Spain for the suppression of heresy, pointing out that persons in the highest positions in France, such as Coligny, d'Andelot, and the Bourbon family, were infected by the new doctrines. Religion was beginning in France to intensify party rivalries and serve as an excuse for partisan revenge. But before negotiation could lead to its full result war had once more to play its part.

The French plan of campaign for 1558 was directed to the capture of Thionville, and, as a sequel, to a double invasion of Flanders. But the delays caused by the long resistance of Thionville, which did not fall until June 22, prevented the simultaneous execution of the two attacks. The Maréchal de Termes from Calais was first in the field, and after sacking Dunkirk and ravaging the country he found himself forced by the Flemish army under Egmont to give battle near Gravelines. Here he suffered a complete defeat (July 13) to which the guns of the English fleet contributed. After this the French armies were compelled to confine themselves to the defensive.

In October peace negotiations were resumed on the north-eastern frontier in the county of Saint Pol. During the course of the discussions Mary Tudor died (November 17). Her death facilitated an agreement in two ways. In the first place it reduced the importance of the question of Calais. Philip had no longer any need to insist on the restitution of this town for the benefit of Elizabeth. In the second place it allowed marriage proposals to weigh in the scales, and, although Philip sued for the hand of Elizabeth of England, there was little to be expected in that quarter. After the conference had been removed to Cateau-Cambrésis (February, 1559) Elizabeth, finding that Spain was not supporting her demands for restitution, agreed that France should retain Calais for eight years, and the way was cleared for the main compact. The peace was signed on April 2. The last point decided was that Philip should marry Elizabeth of France.

France restored Marienburg, Thionville, Damvillers, and Montmédy,

receiving in return Saint Quentin, Ham, le Catelet, and Térouanne; Bouvines and Bouillon were given back to the Bishop of Liége; Philip retained Hesdin. Montferrat, the Milanese, Corsica, Savoy, Bresse, and Piedmont were abandoned by the French; except for the places of Turin, Pinerolo, Chieri, Chivasso, and Villanuova in the territory of Asti. Montalcino was to be given up to the Duke of Tuscany. France did not press for the restitution of Navarre, but retained Saluzzo.

Thus the contest of sixty years reached its close, never to revive in the same form. The boundaries of the Netherlands were restored with slight alterations. Italy was left as Charles had fixed her system. Savoy was re-established as a buffer-State between France and Italy; a position which the genius of her Dukes would use to good advantage. No treaty marks a more definite stage in the development of the European state system. It involved the acceptance of Spanish supremacy in Italy, and the recognition of the organic unity of France, of Spain, and of the Netherlands. For all her concessions France received compensation in the debateable land which lies between the southern boundaries of the Netherlands and the northern slopes of the Alps. Here the international struggles of the next century would be fought out, until French ambition returned once more to attempt the conquest of the Netherlands, and the obliteration of the Pyrenees. The death of Henry II, and the accession of Elizabeth in England, the death of Paul IV, the marriage of Philip with Elizabeth of France, and the death of Charles V, all occurring within twelve months contributed to emphasise the close of an old epoch, the beginning of a new one. The policy of Montmorency had triumphed over that of the Guises; the obstinate persistence of Charles V had received its posthumous reward; and the outbreak of the wars of religion in France on the one hand, the revolt of the Netherlands on the other, were before long to paralyse all those remaining forces and ambitions which might have reversed the decisions recorded at Cateau-Cambrésis. The Reformation had hitherto run its course almost without opposition; henceforward the energies, which had been absorbed in the long dynastic struggle, would be occupied by the still greater contests arising out of the Counter-Reformation movement. In these contests the resumption of the Council of Trent, and its policy and conclusions, furnished the dogmatic basis, and defined the controversial issues.

Throughout this period there have been two main plots in European history, the one centring in Germany and concerned with the questions of religious reform, the other centring in Italy, and leading to the permanent settlement of territorial questions in Europe. The plots are interwoven, and it has been only possible in the foregoing pages occasionally to indicate important points of contact. But each can be to some extent isolated. The German plot is reserved for full treatment in later

chapters. The Italian plot has for its chief actors, on the one side Spain and the Netherlands, on the other side France, while Savoy and the lesser States of Italy each contribute their share to the action. The internal affairs of Italy have received in the description of the main plot such attention as space permitted, and as was necessary to explain the forces at work. But the internal affairs of France, Spain, and the Netherlands have been left aside. Yet some knowledge of these is required if we are to understand the power exerted by each in the forcible settlement of European questions.

The course of the reform movement in France is related below; the institutions of France are described in the first volume of this *History*. It remains only to give some account of those internal developments and changes that affected the activity of France as a European power.

In the institutions of France there is little change to record. The absolute monarchy had been already established, and was further developed by the school of legists, who had their head-quarters in the University of Toulouse. At their head was the Chancellor Duprat. Their principles and their action aimed at the continuous extension of the royal power. From the King they received their employment and their reward; to his strength they owed everything. All their efforts were directed to its increase both in State and in Church. In the Church especially the Concordat of 1516 proved a valuable instrument in their hands. The absolute authority of the Crown over the Church is proved by the lavish grants frequently made by the clergy to the King, enforced at need by the seizure of property: and by the proposals to sell clerical lands for the King's benefit put forward in 1561 at St Germain. The clergy then offered willingly 16,600,000 *livres* to avoid this danger, so real did it appear. The old Gallicanism of the Pragmatic died hard, finding its last strongholds in the Parliaments and the Universities; and was not finally defeated until the *lit de justice* of 1527, which removed all jurisdiction relative to high ecclesiastical office from the *Parlement*, and gave it to the *Grand Conseil*. The old Gallicanism was replaced by a new royal Gallicanism, which resented interference with the ecclesiastical affairs of France from beyond the Alps, but placed the Church at the mercy of the King. In consequence of this subjection of the French Church to the King the clergy of France fell into two well-marked divisions: those who held or hoped for rich ecclesiastical promotion from the King, and the poor parochial clergy, who thought and suffered, and whose importance as a political factor will be seen in the Wars of Religion.

Though the general lines remain unaltered, administrative changes can be perceived. The elevation of Jacques de Beaune de Semblançay (1518) to the cognisance of all the King's finances, extraordinary as well as ordinary, shows the desire for some unification; but his fall in 1527

proves that the new arrangements were not supposed to have worked well. The establishment of the *Trésor de l'épargne* in 1523 shows the same effort for centralisation; this measure weakened the *Trésoriers* and *Généraux*, and brought the whole question of finance under the eyes of the King's Council. The scope of the *Trésor de l'épargne* was gradually widened; and in 1542 a more radical reform was introduced; the old financial districts were abolished; and 16 new centres were established for the receipt of all funds arising from the areas assigned to them. These reforms were in the right direction, but did not go far enough.

The sources of revenue were unchanged. The *taille* was still the mainstay of the government, and was increased at will. In 1543 it reached a figure higher than in the time of Louis XI. Extraordinary supplies were raised by the sale of domain lands, and by the creation of new offices, intended to be sold. The consequent multiplication of unnecessary officials, each anxious to recoup his expenditure, was the gravest abuse of the time. Under Francis I the system of *aides* was gradually extended to the provinces which had hitherto enjoyed immunity; and, in spite of solemn engagements, the *quart du sel* of Guyenne was first (1541) raised to three-eighths; and then in 1545 the *gabelle du sel*, with its system of compulsory purchase, was put in full force in all the south-western provinces. The revolt of La Rochelle (1542) and of Guyenne in general (1548) did not prevent the execution of these decrees.

Similarly in the department of justice changes are rather administrative than constitutional. The introduction of the *présidiaux*, a board of judges appointed for each *bailliage* or *sénéchaussée*, and intermediate between the *Parlements* and the Courts of first instance, was probably advantageous to the people, though its immediate object was the raising of money by the sale of the new offices. The Edict of Villers-Cotterets (1539) was a great landmark in the administration of justice and in the history of legal procedure in France; it instituted the use of the French language in the Courts, and superseded ecclesiastical jurisdiction in the great majority of cases by the lay tribunals. The clergy in 1552 paid three millions of crowns to recover these rights of jurisdiction; but apparently the King did not fulfil his share in the bargain.

The old military system changed slowly. The mounted archers were gradually being separated from the *gens d'armes*, whose following they had originally constituted. As the importance of hand firearms increased the number of archers was diminished; and some attempt was made so to strengthen the defensive armour of horse and man as to meet this new weapon of offence. *Chevau-légers*, trained after the Stradiot fashion, and other varieties of cavalry begin to appear. But in infantry France was still deficient. The attempt of Francis I (1543) to form seven provincial legions, each of 6000 foot, alarmed the gentry by placing arms in the hands of the peasantry, and for this reason or because of

Francis' habitual inconsequence it was abandoned, and only served as a pretext for levying the additional impost for which this measure was made an excuse.

Thus the chief interest of the time for France consisted in the persons who conducted the government. The system might not change, but the spirit in which it was administered depended on the King and the persons in whom he had trust. Inattentive as he was to business, the character of Francis I had a marked effect upon the history of his reign. The profuse expenditure on his Court must have reacted on his foreign policy. The cost of the Court is estimated by a Venetian ambassador as amounting to 1,500,000 crowns a year, *i.e.* about three millions of *livres tournois*. Of this sum 600,000 crowns went in pensions. The King's buildings, important as they are in the history of art, weighed heavily upon his people. The influence of the King's mistresses, Madame de Chateaubriand and Madame d'Étampes, and of his son's mistress, Diane de Poitiers, decided the fate of ministers if not of nations. In the early years of the King's reign, and particularly during his captivity, the influence of the Queen-Mother, Louise of Savoy, was predominant. Her powerful will and vigorous though narrow intellect were not without their value for France; but her rapacity was unlimited, and led to the treason of the Duke of Bourbon, the most important domestic incident of the reign. During his early years Francis was dominated by Bonnivet, and to a less degree by Lautrec and Lescun; during his later life (1541-7) Admiral Annebaut (de Retz) and the Cardinal de Tournon came to the front. The Duc d'Enghien also enjoyed so much favour that his accidental death was ascribed by Court gossip to the act of the Dauphin himself. In the King's middle life Philippe de Brion had considerable power. But none of these courtiers can be said to have possessed a definite scheme of policy or to have worked for any definite end. More important was the part played by Anne de Montmorency.

So early as 1522 Montmorency became a Marshal of France. In the negotiations for the King's freedom after Pavia he took a prominent part, and was shortly afterwards appointed *grand maître* (1526), and from that time until 1541 he was the most conspicuous person at the King's Court. He was Governor of Languedoc, a post previously held by the Constable de Bourbon, the duties of which he executed as a rule by deputy. The tendencies of his policy were favourable to the Emperor. He was unwilling to break the peace, to form alliances with the Protestant Princes or with the Sultan. Thus the period of his influence shows a certain touch of moderation. Montmorency was not always able to make his counsels prevail; but their weight was always on the side of compromise. In the conclusion of the Treaty of Cambray his influence is especially to be seen. On the other hand there is little reason to believe that the *grand maître* contributed anything masterly

to the inconsequent foreign policy of Francis; any notable ideas of strategy to his army. His intellect was mediocre, and his most brilliant achievement was the devastation of Provence in 1536, which frustrated the invasion of Charles.

In 1538 he reached the culmination of his fortunes under Francis, when he was created Constable of France. The interview at Aigues-Mortes belongs to this period, when his influence was perhaps at its height. He must have the responsibility of the policy which allowed Charles a free hand in the chastisement of Ghent (1540). The failure of this policy left France isolated, unable to rely either upon England or upon the German Protestants. His fall, however, in 1541 was rather due to a Court intrigue, to the fear of Francis of his heir-apparent, to the jealousy of Madame d'Étampes and of Diane de Poitiers, than to the actual failure of his schemes. The party of Madame d'Étampes won the day, and the Constable retired into private life.

Francis retained so much animosity against him that he is said to have warned his son before his death not to admit Montmorency to his favour. But the advice, if given, had little effect, and immediately on his accession Henry recalled the Constable to the royal Councils, and even paid the arrears of his pensions for the years of his suspension. The alliance between the Constable and Diane was intimate, but she perceived the danger of having him all-powerful. The Princes of the House of Guise, cadets of the sovereign House of Lorraine, and nearly related to the Houses of Anjou and Bourbon, were the instruments whom she found. Their father, Claude, Duc de Guise, a contemporary of Francis I, had not succeeded in pushing his own fortunes at Court, but had nevertheless found opportunities to serve the King by levying troops for him and otherwise, so that he was able to secure dignities for himself, with offices and benefices for his relations. His brother, Jean, Cardinal of Lorraine, was not inconspicuous at the Court of Francis and in the history of the French Renaissance. But the high fortunes of the family begin with the sons of Claude; among whom are pre-eminent, Francis, the soldier, afterwards Duc de Guise, and Charles, Archbishop of Reims, and afterwards Cardinal. Under Henry II the places of power and profit, the spoils of discarded favourites, the determination of the King's policy, are divided between Montmorency and the Guises; while Diane de Poitiers secured through their rivalry the decisive intermediate position. The Guise policy was aggressive, enterprising, provocative. Montmorency was more cautious, and favourable to peace. To the former were due the League of Rome and the rupture of the Truce of Vaucelles; to the latter the Truce of Vaucelles, and above all, the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis. All alike were zealous Catholics; all alike rapacious and greedy. In view of the powerful elements disputing the supremacy over her husband Catharine de' Medici wisely kept in the background. Her capacities for rule and intrigue were not seen until a later age.

Montmorency had the advantage through his powerful character, his industry, and will; the Guises through their skill in winning the people and the interests to their side; in the Church, in the army, in the *Parlement* their influence was great and was carefully developed. On the other hand, the immense ransoms exacted from Montmorency in 1559 for himself and his relatives impoverished his estate, and the Peace of Cateau-Cambrésis was unpopular and diminished his credit. Thus, after the death of Henry II the advantage lay with the younger rivals of the Constable.

The changes in the system of the Spanish monarchy during the period are even less significant than those in France. The Cortes of Castile continued to meet and to retain their hold upon finance. The *servicio* became a regular impost, voted every three years. On the other hand, the *alcabala* was a ground for frequent bargaining between the King and the Cortes, and the advantage fell to the latter; for the total nett income raised from this source did not increase during the reign, while the purchasing power of money was diminished by at least one half. The real limitation of the royal power in Spain is seen in the refusal of all three Estates, exceptionally summoned to the Cortes of 1538, to agree to Charles' proposal to raise money by a new excise on meat. The power of the Crown over the Cortes, if it was increasing, was increasing slowly, and its increase was due to the extension of royal authority in the towns, where the royal *corregidor* was becoming more autocratic, and the *regidores* themselves were appointed by the Crown. The pressure of the *hidalgos* for admission to municipal office, which is a notable feature of the time, would tend also gradually to divorce the ruling class in the towns from those who carried on its business and felt the real pinch of tyranny or maladministration.

In Spain more than elsewhere the interests of the Church and the Crown were closely linked. The Church looked to royal protection against heresy and against the Cortes. The King looked to the Church for supplies in time of need; he had its good government thoroughly at heart; he supported and moderated the action of the Inquisition so far as he could, for the Inquisition, though based on royal authority, was not entirely under his control. The forcible conversion of the Moriscos of Valencia in 1525 and following years attests the zeal, rather than the wisdom of Charles. The flight of a large part of this industrious class, and the discontent and apprehensions of those who remained, living as they did in constant fear of the Holy Office, was a main cause of the impoverishment of a considerable part of Spain. Charles seems himself to have perceived his error, and the severity of the decrees against the Moriscos was considerably relaxed during his later years.

In Spain also the administrative developments are more conspicuous than the constitutional. The business of government was becoming more and more complicated. Under Ferdinand and Isabella we have

already the Councils of State, of Finance, and of Castile, besides the Council of Aragon; and in addition the Councils of the Inquisition, of the Military Orders, and of the Cruzada. Under Charles we have in addition the Chamber, the Council of War, the Council of the Indies, the Council of Flanders, and the Council of Italy. The several fields of these Councils, with a monarch who was absent from Spain for one-half of the total period of his reign, required to be carefully limited and circumscribed. This led in its turn to the transaction of more and more business by writing, and that to red-tape and its accompanying delays; so that the excessive elaboration of bureaucratic methods tended to hamper and impede the despatch of business. This became even more conspicuous in the time of Philip.

The problem of the decline of Spain has often occupied the minds of historians, who are at a loss to discover why the country which fills so large a place on the European canvas during the sixteenth century afterwards fell into impotence and decay. But the contrast has generally been exaggerated. Spain was never very rich and never very powerful. Individual Spaniards showed great enterprise and great talents. Ferdinand, and after him Charles V, obtained from their country all the energy of which it was capable. The Spanish foot-soldier had admirable qualities. But the work of Charles V depended as much upon the Netherlands as upon Spain; Italian enterprise was supported as much from the Low Countries as from Spain; and from both together support was always insufficient, and had to be eked out by local oppression. No great national impulse raised the Habsburgs to the head of Europe; the conquest of the Indies was due more to good fortune and the enterprise of a few men than to the greatness of the Spanish nation. When Spain lost the stimulus of great rulers, when she was deprived of the efficient support of the Netherland commercial wealth, when she was thrown upon her own resources, then the true weakness of the national character disclosed itself. The Spaniards could never be a great nation because they were never industrious.

Nevertheless, if Spain ever had an age of industry, it was in the time of Charles V. From the time of the conquest of Mexico an immense opening was offered to Spanish trade. Charles was anxious to encourage this trade. In 1529 he opened the export trade to a number of cities of the East and the North, and broke down to some extent the monopoly of Seville. As a consequence many industries increased by leaps and bounds. The silk industry in Toledo and Seville, the cloth industry in Toledo, Cordova, Cuenca and Segovia reached considerable dimensions. The same stimulus reacted upon agriculture and the wool-growing industry. For a time the new discoveries seemed to have opened an industrial era in Spain. But before long the influx of precious metals, rapid after the conquest of Mexico, more rapid after the conquest of Peru, and immense after the discovery of the silver mines of Potosi,

began to raise the prices of commodities in Spain, far above the level current in other countries. This made Spain a bad seller and a profitable market. In spite of all the laws against export of treasure the merchants managed to exchange their wares of foreign manufacture for Spanish bullion, and to transport it beyond the border. The trade with the Spanish colonies stimulated competition. The legislation of 1552 encouraged import and discouraged export in the interests of the inhabitants of Spain. The industries that had flourished began once more to shrink; the influx of treasure, with the appearance of wealth which it brought to so many, discouraged exertion, always distasteful to the Spaniards, and by the end of the reign of Charles V the period of industrial activity was already in its decline. This was not due to the severity of taxation—having regard to the rise of prices the taxes of Spain probably became lighter during the period—but to the natural action of the circumstances upon the national temperament, aided by bad laws and a misconceived economic policy. But the worst results of these forces and methods fall outside our period.

The returns from the colonies enriched the government and individuals rather than the nation. The fifth share of the treasury in all treasure imported and other profits from colonial trade brought the revenue from this source in 1551 to 400,000 and in 1556 to 700,000 ducats. The whole treasure of the Indian fleet was seized for the first time in 1535 by way of loan; and the evil precedent was followed in later years, until forbidden by a law of Philip in 1567.

In the government of the Indies Charles took a lively interest, and his belief in their future was not to be shaken. His relations with his great adventurers were not always happy. Cortes ended his days in a maze of litigation. Fernando Pizarro was imprisoned in 1539 for a long period. Francisco was killed by the insurgents, against whom the home government gave him insufficient support. Gonzalo Pizarro was executed for rebellion in 1548. But the difficulties of controlling these autocratic soldiers at a distance of 4000 miles accounts for many misunderstandings; and the natural tendency to local despotism and virtual independence required constant supervision and suggested suspicion. In regard to the treatment of the natives and the question of the *encomiendas* Charles' policy was humane; though his measures were only in part successful. He leant a ready ear to the representations of Las Casas, and supported the missionaries against the colonists. On the whole his colonial policy achieved its objects; the natives were preserved from extermination or universal slavery; while the provinces of Mexico, Peru, Bolivia, Northern Chili, with Venezuela, New Granada, and Central America were in his reign reduced to order and tolerable government. The spice trade with the Moluccas he endeavoured at one time to secure for the Spaniards; but in 1529 he was content to leave the monopoly to the Portuguese in return for an ample money compensation.

The provinces of the Netherlands inherited by Charles were substantially increased before his death. The French *enclave* of Tournay was conquered in 1521. After a long period of civil war Friesland was finally annexed in 1523. The expulsion of the Bishop of Utrecht by the Duke of Gelders was the excuse for the acquisition of the temporal sovereignty of this important diocese by Charles in 1527; and the city of Utrecht was reconquered in 1528. The endless struggle with the Duke of Gelders did not end with the death of Charles of Egmont in 1538; but the rapid campaign of Charles against the Duke of Cleves resulted in the final incorporation of Gelders with the Burgundian possessions in 1543. Groningen and the neighbouring territory had been acquired in 1536. In 1543 Charles forced also Cambray to accept a garrison. Liége, though still in nominal independence, was brought more and more under Burgundian influence. Its Bishop, Évrard de la Marck, maintained with Charles almost unbroken friendship until his death in 1538. Then Charles procured the election of his uncle George, the bastard son of Maximilian. Charles used the territory of Liége as his own, building on it the fortress of Marienburg (1546), and after the capture of this town Charlemont and Philippeville in 1554.

Thus the area of Burgundian supremacy was widened and its boundaries rectified; and in 1548 the status of the Provinces with reference to the Empire was revised. The whole of them was included in the Burgundian Circle; they were declared not to be subject to the laws of the Empire; they were bound however to contribute to imperial subsidies, and received in return the protection of the Empire. The effect of this measure was to sever the connexion between the Empire and the Netherlands; for the protection was a figment, and the contribution remained unpaid. The suzerainty of France over Flanders and Artois had been renounced in 1529, and thus the Burgundian possessions became a single and independent whole. The Pragmatic Sanction of 1548 further declared that the law of succession for all the Provinces should be henceforth the same, and prevented the danger of a divided inheritance.

The regency of Margaret of Savoy, which ended in 1530, and that of Maria of Hungary, which terminated in 1552, were both directed by the supreme will of Charles, though much discretion was left to these able and faithful vicegerents. The centralisation of the government was carried further. Councils of State and of Finance for the whole aggregate were established. A central Court of Appeal was set up at Malines, though its authority was not universally accepted. The States-General for all the principalities were frequently summoned; and, although their decisions were not legally binding on the several States, every effort was made to enforce the will of the majority upon every district. Here as elsewhere Charles respected the constitution and did not attempt to enforce his will against the vote of the States. Many

instances are on record in which he was obliged to give way. The newly acquired provinces were not immediately incorporated in the assembly of States-General.

In the Netherlands, as in his other dominions, Charles endeavoured to enforce his will upon the Church. But the rival interests of the great alien sees, possessing ecclesiastical authority over the chief part of his territory, rendered this difficult; and his plan for the creation of six national dioceses failed owing to the opposition of the existing prelates and the Roman See. But in the matter of heresy he succeeded in holding his own for his lifetime. Early in 1521 before the Diet of Worms he issued his first edict in the Netherlands against Luther. By repeated laws, increasing in stringency, he kept if not the Reformed opinions at any rate their public expression within bounds; and the only serious danger of an outbreak in the Netherlands under Charles was at the time of the Anabaptist movement at Münster (1535), when the attempted seizure of Amsterdam by those sectaries led to a more rigorous persecution of them in various parts of the Netherlands. The Inquisition was established on a secular basis, for Charles could not afford to give this powerful instrument into the hands of alien Bishops or the Holy See. But under the surface the forces were growing; the movement was amorphous and heterogeneous; Lutheranism in the North, Zwinglian views in the South, Anabaptist doctrine among the more violent, and towards the end of the reign the more methodical and better organised Calvinistic system were spreading in spite of the Inquisition. The persecution of Charles, which, although vigorous in appearance, was in effect not especially severe, succeeded in concealing rather than in preventing the spread of heresy. This legacy he left to his son.

Indeed, though the Netherlands flourished under Charles, though their trade prospered through the connexion with Spain and the Indies, though the wealth of Antwerp and Amsterdam increased year by year, though peace was preserved and apparent obedience, though territory was rounded off and hostile provinces incorporated, the seeds were being sown which bore fruit in the days of Philip. The pressure of taxation was severe. The Spanish garrisons introduced in the early years of Charles' reign were hated here as elsewhere. Religious causes of discord were constantly growing. Charles spent but a small part of his reign in the Netherlands, but his early years were passed there, and he was never a stranger, nor out of sympathy. His son was a Spaniard, and his home in Spain. The days of Margaret and Maria were to be followed by the rule of a different class of proconsuls, with a different kind of instructions. Then the accumulated discontent, the weariness of long-continued burdens borne in a cause that was not their own, the strain of the prolonged strife with France, their natural friend, all the errors and mistaken policy of Charles, would make themselves felt; the issue of these things will be seen in a later volume.

CHAPTER IV.

LUTHER.

The Reformation of the sixteenth century had its birth and growth in a union of spiritual and secular forces such as the world has seldom seen at any other period of its history. On the secular side, the times were full of new movements, intellectual and moral, political, social, and economic; and spiritual forces were everywhere at work, which aimed at making religion the birthright and possession of the common man—whether king, noble, burgher, artisan, or peasant—as well as of the ecclesiastic, a possession which should directly promote a worthy life within the family and the State. These religious impulses had all a peculiar democratic element and were able to impregnate with passion and, for a time, to fuse together the secular forces of the period. Hence their importance historically. If the main defect in the earlier histories of the Reformation has been to neglect the secular sides of the movement, it is possible that more recent historians have been too apt to ignore the religious element which was a real power.

It may be an exaggeration to say, as is sometimes done, that this religious side of the Reformation began in the inward religious growth of a single personality—the river comes from a thousand nameless rills and not only from one selected fountain-head; yet Luther was so prominent a figure that the impulses in his religious life may be taken as the type of forces which were at work over a wide area, and the history of these forces may be fitly described in tracing the genesis and growth of his religious opinions from his early years to his struggle against Indulgences.

The real roots of the religious life of Luther must be sought for in the family and in the popular religious life of the times. What had Luther and Myconius and hundreds of other boys of the peasant and burgher classes been taught by their parents within the family, and what religious influences met them in high-school and University? Fortunately the writings of the leaders of the new religious movement abound in biographical details; and the recent labours of German historians enable us to form some idea of the discordant elements in the religious life at the close of the fifteenth century.

The religion taught by parents to children in pious German families seems to have been simple, unaffected and evangelical. Myconius relates how his father, a burgher, was accustomed to expound the Apostles' Creed to the boy and to tell him that Jesus Christ was the Saviour from all sins; that the one thing needed to obtain God's pardon for sins was to pray and to trust; and how he insisted above all that the forgiveness of God was a free gift, bestowed without fee by God on man for the sake of what Christ had done. Little books suitable for family instruction were in circulation in which were printed the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, and sometimes one or two Psalms in the German tongue. Simple catechisms and other small books of devotion seem to have been in circulation which were full of very simple evangelical teaching. It is probable that Luther repeated a great deal of what was commonly taught to children in his own earliest years, when, in later days, he himself wrote little books for the young. Traces of this simple family piety, which insisted that all holiness came from "trusting in the holy passion of Christ," and that nothing which the sinner could do for himself availed anything, may be found all down the stream of medieval religious life in the most popular hymns and in the sermons of the great revival preachers.

The latter half of the fifteenth century saw the growth of a form of piety very different from that simple household religion. A strange terror seemed to brood over the people. The plague came periodically into the crowded and badly drained towns; new diseases made their appearance and added to the prevailing fear; the dread of a Turkish invasion seemed to be prevalent—mothers scared their children by naming the Turks, and in hundreds of German parishes the bells tolled in the village steeples calling the people to pray to God to deliver them from Turkish raids. This prevailing fear bred a strange restlessness. Crowds of pilgrims thronged the highways, trudging from shrine to shrine, hoping to get deliverance from fear and assurance of pardon for sins. Princes who could afford a sufficiently large armed guard visited the holy places in Palestine and brought back relics which they stored in their private chapels; the lesser nobility and the richer burghers made pilgrimages to Rome, especially during the Jubilee years, which became somewhat frequent in the later Middle Ages, and secured indulgences by visiting and praying before the several shrines in the Holy City. For the common folk of Germany, in the last decades of the fifteenth century, the favourite place of pilgrimage was Compostella in Spain, and, in the second degree, Einsiedeln in Switzerland. It was said that the bones of St James the Brother of our Lord had been brought from Palestine to Compostella; and the shrine numbered its pilgrims by the hundred thousand a year. So famous and frequented was this place of pilgrimage that a special, one might almost say a professional, class of pilgrims came into existence, the *Jacobsbrüder*, who were continually on the roads

coming to or from Compostella, seeking to win pardon for themselves or others by their wandering devotion.

Sometimes the desire to go on pilgrimage became almost an epidemic. Bands of children thronged the roads, bareheaded and clad in nothing but their shirts; women left their families and men deserted their work. In vain preachers of morals like Geiler von Kaisersberg denounced the practice and said that on pilgrimages more sinners were created than sins pardoned. The terror swayed men and they fled to shrines where they believed they could find forgiveness; the pilgrimage songs make a small literature; and pilgrim guide-books, like the *Mirabilia Romae* and *Die Walfart und Strasse zu Sant Jacob*, appeared in many languages.

This revival of religion had its special effect on men destined to a religious life. The secular clergy seem to have been the least affected. Chronicles, whether of towns or of families, bear witness to the degradation of morals among the parish priests and the superior clergy. The Benedictines and their dependent Orders of monks do not appear to have shared largely in the religious movement. It was different however with the Dominicans, the Franciscans, and the mendicant Augustinians. These begging friars reformed themselves strenuously, in the medieval sense of reformation. They went back to their old lives of mortifying the flesh, of devoting themselves to works of practical benevolence and of self-denying activity. As a consequence, they, and not the parish clergy, had become the trusted religious leaders of the people. Their chapels were thronged by the common folk, and the better disposed nobles and burghers took them for their confessors and spiritual directors. It was in vain that the Roman Curia proclaimed, by its Legates in Germany, the old doctrine that the benefits of religious acts do not depend upon the personal character of the administrators, that it published regulations binding all parishioners to confess at least once a year to their parish priests. The people, high and low, felt that Bishops who rode to the Diet accompanied by their concubines disguised in men's clothing, and parish priests who were tavern-keepers or the most frequent customers at the village public-house, were not true spiritual guides. They turned for the consolations of religion to the poor-living, hard-working Franciscans and Augustinian Eremites who listened to their confessions and spoke comfortingly to their souls, who taught the children and said masses without taking fees. The last decades of the fifteenth century were the time of a revival in the spiritual power and devotion of the mendicant Orders.

One result of the underlying fear which inspired this religious revival was the way in which the personality of Christ was constantly regarded in the common Christian thought of the time as it is revealed to us in autobiographies, in sermons, and in pictorial representations. The Saviour was concealed behind the Judge, who was to come to punish the wicked. Luther tells us that when he was a boy in the

parish church his childish imagination was inflamed by the stained-glass picture of Jesus, not the Saviour, but the Judge, of a fierce countenance, seated on a rainbow, and carrying a flaming sword in His hand. This idea prevented pious people who held it from approaching Jesus as an intercessor. He Himself needed to be interceded with on behalf of the poor sinners He was coming to judge. And this thought in turn gave to the adoration of the Virgin Mother a strength and intensity hitherto unknown in medieval religion. The doctrine of the Immaculate Conception had strenuous advocates; men and women formed themselves into confraternities that they might beseech her intercession with the strength that numbers give; and these confraternities spread all over Germany. The intercessory powers of the Virgin Mother became a more and more important element in the popular religion, and little books of devotion were in circulation—the *Little Gospel*, the *Pearl of the Passion*—which related with many a comment the words of Christ on the Cross to St John and to the Virgin. Then the idea grew up that the Virgin herself had to be interceded with in order to become an intercessor; and her mother, St Anne, became the object of a cult which may almost be called new. This "Cult of the Blessed Anna" rapidly extended itself in ever-widening circles until there were few districts in Germany which had not their confraternities devoted to her service. Such was the prevailing enthusiastic popular religion of the last decades of the fifteenth century—the religion which met and surrounded a sensitive boy when he left his quiet home and entered the world. It had small connexion, save in the one point of the increased reverence paid to the Virgin, with the theology of the Schools, but it was the religious force among the people.

Side by side with this flamboyant popular religion can be discerned another spiritual movement so unlike it, so utterly divergent from it in character and in aim, that it is surprising to detect its presence within the same areas and at the same period, and that we need scarcely wonder that it has been so largely overlooked. Its great characteristic was that laymen began to take into their own hands matters which had hitherto been supposed to be the exclusive property of churchmen. We can discern the impulse setting in motion at the same time princes, burghers, and artisans, each class in its own way.

The Great Council of Constance had pledged the Church to a large number of practical reforms, aiming at the reinvigoration of the various local ecclesiastical institutions. These pledges had never been fulfilled, and their non-fulfilment accounts for one side of the German opposition to Rome. During the last decades of the fifteenth century some of the German Princes assumed the right to see that within their lands proper discipline was exercised over the clergy as well as over the laity. To give instances would need more space than this chapter affords. It is enough to say that the *jus episcopale* which Luther claimed in later

days for the civil power had been exercised, and that for the good of the people, in the lands of Brandenburg and of Saxony before the close of the fifteenth century. We have therefore this new thing, that the laity in power had begun to set quietly aside the immunities and privileges of the Church, to this extent at least, that the civil authorities compelled the local ecclesiastical institutions within their dominions to live under the rule of reform laid down by an ecumenical council, and that they did this despite the remonstrances of the superior ecclesiastical authorities.

The same assertion of the rights of laymen to do Christian work in their own way appears when the records of the boroughs are examined. The whole charitable system of the Middle Ages had been administered by the Church; all bequests for the relief of the poor had been placed in the hands of the clergy; and all donations for the relief of the poor were given to clerical managers. The burghers saw the charitable bequests of their forefathers grossly perverted from their original purposes, and it began to dawn upon them that, although the law of charity was part of the law of Christ, it did not necessarily follow that all charities must be under ecclesiastical administration. Hence cases appear, and that more frequently as the years pass, where burghers leave their charitable bequests to be managed by the town council or other secular authority; and this particular portion of Christian work ceased to be the exclusive possession of the clergy.

Another feature of the times was the growth of an immense number of novel religious associations or confraternities. They were not, like the praying circles of the Mystics or of the *Gottesfreunde*, strictly non-clerical or anti-clerical, they had no objection to the protection of the Church, but they had a distinctively lay character. Some of them were associations of artisans; and these were commonly called *Kalands*, because it was one of their rules to meet once a month for divine service, usually in a chapel belonging to one of the mendicant Orders. Others bore curious names, such as *St Ursula's Schifflein*, and enforced a rule that all the members must pray a certain number of times a week. Pious people frequently belonged to a number of these associations. The members united for religious purposes, generally under the auspices of the Church; but they were confraternities of laymen and women who had marked out for themselves their own course of religious duties quite independently of the Church and of its traditional ideals. Perhaps no greater contribution could be made to our knowledge of the quiet religious life at the close of the fifteenth century than to gather together in a monograph what can be known about these religious confraternities.

Such was the religious atmosphere into which Luther was born and which he breathed from his earliest days. His mother taught him the simple evangelical hymns which had fed her own spiritual growth; his father had that sturdy common-sense piety which belonged to so many

of the better disposed nobles, burghers, and artisans of the time; while the fear of Jesus the Judge, who was coming to judge and punish the wicked, branded itself on his child's soul when he gazed up at the vengeful picture of our Lord. He was taught at home the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, words of Jesus from the Gospels, the Creed, such simple hymns as *Christ ist erstanden, Ein kindelein so löbelich,* and *Nun bitten wir den heiligen Geist*—all that went to make what he long afterwards called "the faith of the children." His father's strong dislike to monks and friars; the Hussite propaganda, which, in spite of all attempts at repression, had penetrated the Harz and Thuringia; the Mansfeld police regulations, with other evidence from the local chronicles, show how much the lay religion had made its way among the people. The popular revival displayed itself in the great processions and pilgrimages made to holy places in his neighbourhood—to Kyffhäuser, where there was a miraculous wooden cross, to the Bruno Chapel of Quernfurt, to the old chapel at Welfesholz, and to the cloister church at Wimmelberg.

Martin Luther was born on November 10, 1483, at Eisleben, and spent his childhood in Mansfeld. His father, Hans, was a miner in the Mansfeld district, where the policy of the Counts of Mansfeld, to build and let out on hire small smelting furnaces, enabled thrifty and skilled workmen to rise in the world.

The boy grew up amidst the toilsome, grimy, often coarse surroundings of the German peasant life—protected from much that was evil by the wise severity of his parents, but sharing in its hardness, its superstitions, and its simple political and ecclesiastical ideas; as that the Emperor was God's ruler on the earth who would protect poor people from the Turk; that the Church was the "Pope's house," in which the Bishop of Rome was the house-father; and that obedience and reverence were due to the lords of the soil. He went to the village school in Mansfeld and endured the cruelties of a merciless pedagogue; he was sent later to a school at Magdeburg, and then to St George's High School at Eisenach. In these boyish days he was a "poor student," *i.e.* one who got his education and lodging free, was obliged to sing in the church choir, and was permitted to sing in the streets, begging for bread. His later writings abound in references to these early school-days and to his own quiet thoughts; and they make it plain that the religion of fear was laying hold on him and driving out the earlier simple family faith. Two pictures branded themselves on his childish mind at Magdeburg. He saw a young Prince of Anhalt, who had forsaken rank and inheritance and, to save his soul, had become a barefooted friar, carrying the huge begging-sack, and worn to skin and bone by his scourgings and fastings and prayers. The other was an altar-piece in a church, the picture of a ship in which was no layman, not even a King or a Prince; in it were the Pope with his Cardinals and Bishops, and the Holy Ghost

hovered over them directing their course, while priests and monks managed the oars and the sails, and thus they went sailing heavenwards. The laymen were swimming in the water beside the ship; some were drowning, others were holding on by ropes which the monks and priests cast out to them to aid them. No layman was in the ship and no ecclesiastic was in the water. The picture haunted him for years. At Eisenach he had some glimpses of the old simple family life, this time accompanied by a new refinement, in the house of the lady whom most biographers identify with Frau Cotta. But the religious atmosphere of the town which the boy inhaled and enjoyed was new. The town was under the spell of St Elizabeth, the pious Landgravine who had given up family life, children, and all earthly comforts, to earn a medieval saintship. Her good deeds were blazoned on the windows of the church in which Luther sang as choir-boy, and he had long conversations with some of the monks who belonged to her foundations. The novel surroundings tended to lead him far from the homely piety of his parents and from the more cultured family religion of his new friends, and he confesses that it was with incredulous surprise that he heard Frau Cotta say that there was nothing on earth more lovely than the love of husband and wife when it is in the fear of the Lord. He had surrendered himself to that revival of crude medieval religion which was based on fear, and which found an outlet in fastings, scourgings, pilgrimages, saint-worship, and in general in the thought that salvation demanded the abandonment of family, friends, and the activities and enjoyments of life in the world.

After three happy years at Eisenach Luther was sent to Erfurt and entered his name on the matriculation roll in letters which can still be read, Martinus Ludher ex Mansfeldt. Hans Luther had been prospering; he was able to pay for his son's college expenses; Luther was no longer a "poor student," but was able to give undivided attention to his studies. The father meant the son to become a trained lawyer; and the lad of seventeen seems to have accepted without question the career marked out for him.

The University of Erfurt was in Luther's days the most famous in Germany. It had been founded in 1392 by the burghers, and academic and burgher life mingled there as nowhere else. The graduation days were town holidays, and the graduation ceremonies always included a procession of the University authorities, the gilds and the town officials, with all the attendant medieval pomp, and concluded with a torchlight march at night. But if the University was strictly allied to the town it was as strongly united to the Church. It had been enriched with numerous papal privileges; its chancellor was the Archbishop of Mainz; many of its theological professors held ecclesiastical prebends, and others were monks of different Orders and notably of the Augustinian Eremites. The whole teaching staff went solemnly to hear

mass at the beginning of every term; each faculty was under the protection of a patron Saint—St George presiding over the faculty of Philosophy; the professors had to swear to teach nothing opposed to the doctrine of the Roman Church; and care was taken to prevent the beginnings and spread of heretical opinions.

The University teaching was medieval in all essentials, but represented the new, as Cologne championed the old, scholasticism. Gabriel Biel, the disciple of William of Occam, had been one of the teachers. Humanism of the German type, which was very different from the Italian, had found an entrance as early as 1460 in the persons of Peter Luder and Jacob Publicius, and in the following years there was a good deal of intercourse between Erfurt scholars and Italian humanists. Maternus Pistoris was lecturing on the Latin classics in 1494 and had for his colleague Nicholas Marschalk, who was the first to establish a printing-press in Germany for Greek books. They had speedily gathered round them a band of enthusiastic scholars, Johannes Jäger of Drontheim (Crotus Rubeanus), Henry and Peter Eberach, George Burkhardt of Spelt (Spalatinus), John Lange, and others known afterwards in the earlier stages of the Reformation movement. Conrad Mutti (Mutianus Rufus), who had studied in Italy, was one of the leaders; Eoban of Hesse (Helius Eobanus Hessus), perhaps the most gifted of them all, joined the circle in 1494. These humanists did not attack openly the older course of study at Erfurt. They wrote complimentary Latin poems in praise of their older colleagues; they formed a select circle who were called the "Poets"; they affected to correspond with each other after the manner of the ancients. In private, Mutianus and Crotus seem to have delighted to reveal their eclectic theosophy to a band of half-terrified, half-admiring youths; to say that there was but one God, who had the various names of Jupiter, Mars, Hercules, Jesus, and one Goddess, who was called Juno, Diana, or Mary as the worshippers chose; but these things were not supposed to be for the public ear.

The University of Erfurt in the beginning of the sixteenth century was the recognised meeting-place of the two opposing tendencies of scholasticism and humanism; and it was also, perhaps in a higher degree than any other university, a place where the student was exposed to many other diverse influences. The system of biblical exegesis first stimulated by Nicholas de Lyra, which cannot be classed under scholasticism or humanism, had found a succession of able teachers in Erfurt. The strong anti-clerical teaching of Jacob of Jüterbogk and of John Wessel, who had taught in Erfurt for fifteen years, had left its mark on the University and was not forgotten. Low mutterings of the Hussite propaganda itself, Luther tells us, could be heard from time to time, urging a strange Christian socialism which was at the same time thoroughly anti-clerical. Then over against all this opportunities were occasionally given, at the visits of papal Legates, for seeing the

magnificence and might of the Roman Church and of the Pope its head. In 1502 and again in 1504, during Luther's student days, Cardinal Raimund, sent to proclaim in Germany new and unheard-of Indulgences, visited the university town. The civic dignitaries, the Rector Magnificus with the whole University, all the clergy, the monks and the school children, accompanied by crowds of the townsfolk, went out in procession to meet him and escort him with due ceremony into the city. Add to this the gross dissipation existing among many of the student sets, and the whisperings of foul living on the part of many of the higher clergy in the town, and some idea can be formed of the sea of trouble, doubt, questioning, and anxiety into which a bright, sensitive, imaginative, and piously disposed lad of seventeen was thrown when he had begun his student life in Erfurt.

When we piece together references in correspondence to Luther's student life, recollections of his fellow-students, and scattered sayings of his own in after-life, we get upon the whole the idea of a very level-headed youth, with a strong sense of the practical side of his studies, thoroughly respected by his professors, refusing to be carried away into any excess of humanist enthusiasm on the one hand or of physical dissipation on the other; intent only to profit by the educational advantages within his reach and to justify the sacrifices which his father was making on his behalf. He had been sent to Erfurt to become a jurist, and the faculty of Philosophy afforded the preparation for the faculty of Law as well as of Theology. Luther accordingly began the course of study prescribed in the faculty of Philosophy—Logic, Dialectic, and Rhetoric, followed by Physics and Astronomy, the teaching in all cases consisting of abstract classification and distinctions without any real study of life or of fact. The teacher he most esteemed was John Trutvetter, the famed "Erfurt Doctor" whose fame and genius, as all good Germans thought, had made Erfurt as well-known as Paris. Scholasticism, he said, left him little time for poetry and classical studies. He does not seem to have attended any of the humanist lectures. But he read privately a large number of the Latin classical authors. Virgil, whose pages he opened with some dread,—for was he not in medieval popular legend a combination of wizard and prophet of Christ?—became his favourite author. His peasant upbringing made him take great delight in the *Bucolics* and *Georgics*—books, he said, that only a herd and a countryman can rightly understand. Cicero charmed him; he delighted in his public labours for his country and in his versatility, and believed him to be a much better philosopher than Aristotle. He read Livy, Terence, and Plautus. He prized the pathetic portions of Horace but esteemed him inferior to Prudentius. He seems also to have read from a volume of selections portions of Propertius, Persius, Lucretius, Tibullus, Silvius Italicus, Statius, and Claudian. We hear of him studying Greek privately with John Lange. But he was never a member

of the humanist circle, and in his student days was personally unacquainted with its leading members. He had none of the humanist enthusiasm for the language and the spirit of the past; what he cared for was the knowledge of human life which classical authors gave him. Besides, the "epicurean" life and ideas of the young humanist circle displeased him. They, on their part, would evidently have received him gladly. They called him "the philosopher," they spoke about his gifts of singing and lute-playing, and of his frank, engaging character. In later days he could make use of humanism; but he never was a humanist in spirit or in aim. He was too much in earnest about religious matters, and of too practical a turn of mind.

Luther's course of study flowed on regularly. He was a bright, sociable, hard-working student and took his various degrees in an exceptionally short time. He was Bachelor in 1502, and Master in 1505, when he stood second among the seventeen successful candidates. He had attained what he had once thought the summit of earthly felicity and found himself marching in a procession of University magnates and civic dignitaries clothed in his new robes. His father, proud of his son's success, sent him the costly present of a *Corpus Juris*. He may have begun to attend lectures in the faculty of Law, when he suddenly retired into a convent and became a monk.

This action was so unexpected that his student friends made all sorts of conjectures about his reasons, and these have been woven into stories which are pure legends. Little or nothing is known about Luther's religious convictions during his stay at Erfurt. This is the more surprising since Luther was the least reticent of men. His correspondence, his sermons, his commentaries, all his books are full of little autobiographical details. He tells what he felt when a child, what his religious thoughts were during his school-days; but he is silent about his thoughts and feelings during his years at Erfurt, and especially during the months which preceded his plunge into the convent. He has himself made two statements about his resolve to become a monk, and they comprise the only accurate information obtainable. He says that the resolve was sudden, and that he left the world and entered the cloister because "he doubted of himself"; that in his case the proverb was true, "doubt makes a monk."

What was the doubting? The modern mind is tempted to imagine intellectual difficulties, to think of the rents in the Church's theology which the criticisms of Occam and of Biel had produced, of the complete antagonism between the whole ecclesiastical mode of thinking and the enlightenment from ancient culture that humanism was producing, and Luther's doubtings are frequently set down to the self-questioning which his contact with humanism in Erfurt had produced. But this idea, if not foreign to the age, was strange to Luther. He doubted whether he could ever do what he thought had to be done by him to save his soul

if he remained in the world. That was what compelled him to enter the convent. The lurid fires of Hell and the pale shades of purgatory which are the constant background to Dante's Paradise were always present to the mind of Luther from boyhood. Could he escape the one and win the other if he remained in the world? He doubted it and entered the convent.

The Order of monks which Luther selected was the Augustinian Eremites. Their history was somewhat curious. Originally they had been formed out of the numerous hermits who lived solitary religious lives throughout Italy and Germany. Several Popes had desired to bring them together into convents; and this was at last effected by Alexander IV, who had enjoined them to frame their constitution according to the Rule of St Augustine. No other order of monks shared so largely in the religious revival of the fifteenth century. The convents which had reformed associated themselves together into what was called the Congregation. The reformed Augustinian Eremites strictly observed their vows of poverty and obedience; they led self-denying lives, they represented the best type of later medieval piety. Their convents were for the most part in the larger towns of Germany, and the monks were generally held in high esteem by the citizens who took them for confessors and spiritual directors. The Brethren were encouraged to study, and this was done so successfully that professorships in theology and in philosophy in most of the Universities of Germany in the fifteenth century were filled by Augustinian Eremites. They also cultivated the art of preaching; most of the larger convents had a special preacher attached; and the townspeople flocked to hear him.

Their theology had little to do with Augustine; nor does Luther appear to have studied Augustine until he had removed to Wittenberg. Their views belonged to the opposite pole of medieval thought and closely resembled those of the Franciscans. No Order paid more reverence to the Blessed Virgin. Her image stood in the Chapter-house of every convent; their theologians were strenuous defenders of the Immaculate Conception; they aided to spread the "cult of the Blessed Anna." They were strong advocates of papal supremacy. In the person of John von Palz, the professor of theology in the Erfurt convent and the teacher of Luther himself, they furnished the most outspoken defender of papal Indulgences. This was the Order into which Luther so suddenly threw himself in 1505.

He spent the usual year as a novice, then took the vows, and was set to study theology. His text-books were the writings of Occam, Biel, and D'Ailly. His aptness for study, his vigour and precision in debate, his acumen, excited the admiration of his teachers. But Luther had not come to the convent to study theology; he had entered to save his soul. These studies were but pastime; his serious and dominating

task was to win the sense of pardon of sin and to see his body a temple of the Holy Ghost. He fasted and prayed and scourged himself according to rule, and invented additional methods of maceration. He edified his brethren; they spoke of him as a model of monastic piety; but the young man—he was only twenty-three—felt no relief and was no nearer God. He was still tormented by the sense of sin which urged him to repeated confession. God was always the implacable judge inexorably threatening punishment for the guilt of breaking a law which it seemed impossible to keep. For it was the righteousness of God that terrified him; the thought that all his actions were tested by the standard of that righteousness of God. His superiors could not understand him. Staupitz, Vicar-General of the Order, saw him on one of his visitations and was attracted by him. He saw his sincerity, his deep trouble, his hopeless despair. He advised him to study the Bible, St Augustine, and Tauler. An old monk helped him for a short time by explaining that the Creed taught the forgiveness of sin as a promise of God, and that what the sinner had to do was to trust in the promise. But the thought would come: Pardon follows contrition and confession; how can I know that my contrition has gone deep enough; how can I be sure that my confession has been complete? At last Staupitz began to see where the difficulty lay, and made suggestions which helped him. The true mission of the medieval Church had been to be a stern preacher of righteousness. It taught, and elevated its rude converts, by placing before them ideals of saintly piety and of ineffable purity, and by teaching them that sin was sin in spite of extenuating circumstances. Luther was a true son of that medieval Church. Her message had sunk deeply into his soul; it had been enforced by his experience of the popular revival of the decades which had preceded and followed his birth. He felt more deeply than most the point where it failed. It contrasted the Divine righteousness and man's sin and weakness. It insisted on the inexorable demands of the law of God and at the same time pronounced despairingly that man could never fulfil them. Staupitz showed Luther that the antinomy had been created by setting over against each other the righteousness of God and the sin and helplessness of man, and by keeping these two thoughts in opposition; then he explained that the righteousness of God, according to God's promise, might become the possession of man in and through Christ. Fellowship of man with God solved the antinomy; all fellowship is founded on personal trust; and faith gives man that fellowship with God through which all things that belong to God can become his. These thoughts, acted upon, helped Luther gradually to win his way to peace of heart. Penitence and confession, which had been the occasions of despair when extorted by fear, became natural and spontaneous when suggested by a sense of the greatness and intimacy of the redeeming love of God in Christ.

The intensity and sincerity of this protracted struggle marked Luther for life. It gave him a strength of character and a living power which never left him. The end of the long inner fight had freed him from the burden which had oppressed him, and his naturally frank, joyous nature found a free outlet. It gave him a sense of freedom, and the feeling that life was something given by God to be enjoyed,—the same feeling that humanism, from its lower level, had given to so many of its disciples. For the moment however nothing seemed questionable. He was a faithful son of the Mediæval Church, "the Pope's house," with its Cardinals and its Bishops, its priests, monks, and nuns, its masses and its relics, its Indulgences and its pilgrimages. All these external things remained unchanged. The one thing that was changed was the relation in which one human soul stood to God. He was still a monk who believed in his vocation. The very fact that his conversion had come to him within the convent made him the more sure that he had done right to take the monastic vow.

Soon after he had attained inward peace Luther was ordained, and Hans Luther came from Mansfeld for the ceremony, not that he took any pleasure in it, but because he did not wish to shame his eldest son. The sturdy peasant adhered to his anti-clerical Christianity, and when his son told him that he had a clear call from God to the monastic life, the father suggested that it might have been a prompting from the devil. Once ordained, it was Luther's duty to say mass and to hear confessions, impose penance and pronounce absolution. He had no difficulties about the doctrines and usages of the Church; but he put his own meaning into the duties and position of a confessor. His own experience had taught him that man could never forgive sin; that belonged to God alone. But the human confessor could be the spiritual guide of those who came to confess to him; he could warn them against false grounds of confidence, and show them the pardoning grace of God

Luther's theological studies were continued. He devoted himself to Augustine, to Bernard, to men who might be called "experimental" theologians. He began to show himself a good man of business, with an eye for the heart of things. Staupitz and his chiefs entrusted him with some delicate commissions on behalf of the Order, and made quiet preparation for his advancement. In 1508 he, with a few other brother monks, was transferred from the convent at Erfurt to that at Wittenberg, to assist the small University there.

Some years before this the Elector Frederick the Wise of Saxony, the head of the Ernestine branch of his House, had resolved to provide a university for his own dominions. He had been much drawn to the Augustinian Eremites since his first acquaintance with them at Grimma when he was a boy at school. Naturally Staupitz became his chief adviser in his new scheme; indeed the University from the first might almost be called an educational establishment belonging to the

Augustinian Eremites. There was not much money to spare at the Electoral Court. A sum got from the sale of Indulgences some years before, which Frederick had not allowed to leave the country, served to make a beginning. Prebends attached to the Castle Church—the Church of All Saints was its ecclesiastical name—furnished the salaries of some of the professors; the other teachers were to be supplied from the monks of the convent of the Augustinian Eremites in the town. The Emperor Maximilian granted the usual imperial privileges, and the University was opened October 18, 1502. Staupitz himself was one of the professors and dean of the faculty of Theology; another Augustinian Eremite was dean of the faculty of Arts. The patron Saints of the Order, the Blessed Virgin and St Augustine, were the patron Saints of the University. Some distinguished teachers, outside the Augustinian Eremites, were induced to come, among others Jerome Schurf from Tübingen; Staupitz collected promising young monks from convents of his Order and enrolled them as students; other youths were attracted by the teachers and came from various parts of Germany. The University enrolled 416 students during its first year. This success, however, appears to have been artificial; the numbers gradually declined to 56 in the summer session of 1505. The first teachers left it for more promising places. Still Staupitz encouraged Frederick to persevere. New teachers were secured—among them Nicholas Amsdorf, who had then a great reputation as a teacher of the old-fashioned scholasticism, and Andrew Bodenstein of Carlstadt. The University began to grow slowly.

Luther was sent to Wittenberg in 1508. He was made to teach the Dialectic and Physics of Aristotle, a task which he disliked, but whether in the University or to the young monks in the convent it is impossible to say. He also began to preach. His work was interrupted by a command to go to Rome on the business of his Order. The Augustinian Eremites, as has been already said, were divided into the unreformed and the reformed convents—the latter being united in an association which was called the Congregation. Staupitz was anxious to heal this schism and to bring all the convents in Germany within the reformation. Difficulties arose, and the interests of peace demanded that both the General of the Order and the Curia should be informed on all the circumstances. A messenger was needed, one whom he could trust and who would also be trusted by the stricter party among his monks. No one seemed more suitable than the young monk Martin Luther.

Luther saw Rome, and the impressions made upon him by his visit remained with him all his life. He and his companion approached the imperial city with the liveliest expectations; but they were the longings of the pious pilgrim, not those of the scholar of the Renaissance—so little impression had humanism made upon him. When he first caught

sight of the city Luther raised his hands in an ecstasy, exclaiming, "I greet thee, thou Holy Rome, thrice holy from the blood of the Martyrs." That was his mood of mind—so little had his convent struggles and the peace he had found in the thought that the just live by faith separated him from the religious ideas of his time.

His official business did not cost much time; he seems to have had no complaints to make against the Curia; indeed the business on which he had been sent seems to have been settled in Germany by an amicable compromise. His official work done, he set himself to see the Holy City with the devotion of a pilgrim and the thoroughness of a German. He visited all the shrines, especially those to which Indulgences were attached. He climbed the thirty-eight steps which led to the vestibule of St Peter's—every step counting seven years' remission of penance; he knelt before all the altars; he listened reverently to all the accounts given him of the various relics and believed them all; he thought that if his parents had been dead, he could, by saying masses in certain chapels, secure them against purgatory. He visited the remains of antiquity which could tell him something of the life of the old Romans—the Pantheon, the Coliseum, and the Baths of Diocletian.

But if Luther was still unemancipated from his belief in relics, in the effect of pilgrimages, and in the validity of Indulgences for the remission of imposed penance, his sturdy German piety and his plain Christian morality turned his reverence of Rome into a loathing. The city he had greeted as holy, he found to be a sink of iniquity; its very priests were infidel, and openly scoffed at the sacred services they performed; the papal courtiers were men of depraved lives; the Cardinals of the Church lived in open sin; he had frequent cause to repeat the Italian proverb, first spread abroad by Machiavelli and by Bembo, "The nearer Rome the worse Christian." It meant much for him in after-days that he had seen Rome for himself.

Luther was back in Wittenberg early in the summer of 1512. Staupitz sent him to Erfurt to complete the steps necessary for the higher graduation in Theology, preparatory to succeeding Staupitz in the Chair of Theology in Wittenberg. He graduated as Doctor of the Holy Scripture, took the Wittenberg doctor's oath to defend evangelical truth vigorously (*viriliter*), was made a member of the Senate three days later, and a few weeks after he succeeded Staupitz as Professor of Theology.

From the first Luther's lectures differed from what were then expected from a professor of theology. It was not that he criticised the theology then current in the Church; he had an entirely different idea of what theology ought to be, and of what it ought to make known. His whole habit of mind was practical, and theology for him was an "experimental" discipline. It ought to be, he thought, a study which would teach how a man could find the grace of God, and, having found it, how he could

persevere in a life of joyous obedience to God and His commandments. He had, himself, sought, and that with deadly earnest, an answer to this question in all the material which the Church of the time had accumulated to aid men in the task. He had tried to find it in the penitential system, in the means of grace, in theology professedly based on Holy Scripture expounded by the later Schoolmen and Mystics, and his search had been in vain. But theologians like Bernard and Augustine had helped him, and as they had taught him he could teach others. That was the work he set himself to do. It was a task to which contemporary theology had not given any special prominence, and which, in Luther's opinion, it had ignored. His theology was new, because in his opinion it ought to be occupied with a new task, not because the conclusions reached by contemporary theology occupied with other tasks were necessarily wrong.

Luther never knew much Hebrew, and he used the Vulgate in his prelections. He had a huge, widely printed volume on his desk, and wrote the heads of his lectures between the printed lines. The pages still exist and can be studied. We can trace the gradual growth of his theology. In the years 1513–15 there is no sign of any attack upon the contemporary Scholastic teaching, no thought but that the monastic life is the flower of Christian piety. He expounded the Psalms; his aids are what are called the mystical passages in St Augustine and in Bernard, but what may be more properly termed those portions of their teaching in which they insist upon and describe personal religion. These thoughts simply push aside the ordinary theology of the day without staying to criticise it. We can discern in the germ what grew to be the main thoughts in the later Lutheran theology. Men are redeemed apart from any merits of their own; man's faith is trust in the verity of God and in the historical work of Christ. These thoughts were for the most part expressed in the formulae common to the scholastic philosophy of the time; but they grew in clearness of expression, and took shape as a series of propositions which formed the basis of his teaching—that man wins pardon through the free grace of God, that when man lays hold on God's promise of pardon he becomes a new creature, that this sense of pardon is the beginning of a new life of sanctification. To these may be added the thoughts that the life of faith is Christianity on its inward side; that the contrast between the economy of law and that of grace is something fundamental; and that there is a real distinction to be drawn between the outward and visible Church and the ideal Church, which is to be described by its spiritual and moral relations to God after the manner of Augustine. The years 1515 and 1516 give traces of a more thorough study of Augustine and of the German Mystics. This comes out in the college lectures on the Epistle to the Romans and in some minor publications. His language loses its scholastic colouring and adopts many of the well-known mystical phrases,

especially when he describes the natural incapacity of men for what is good. Along with this change in language, and evidently related to it, we find evidence that Luther was beginning to think less highly of the monastic life and its external renunciations. Predestination, meaning by that not an abstract metaphysical dogma, but the thought that the whole of the believer's life and what it involved depended in the last resort on God and not on man, came more and more into the foreground. Still there did not appear any disposition to criticise or repudiate the current theology of the day.

But about the middle of 1516 Luther had reached the parting of the ways, and the divergence appeared on the practical and not on the speculative side of theology. It began in a sermon he preached on the theory of Indulgences in July, 1516, and increased month by month—the widening divergence can be clearly traced step by step—until he could contrast "our theology," the theology taught by Luther and his colleagues at Wittenberg, with what was taught elsewhere and notably at Erfurt. The former represented Augustine and the Bible; the latter was founded on Aristotle. In September, 1517, his position had become so clear that he wrote against the scholastic theology, declaring that it was at heart Pelagian and that it obscured and buried out of sight the Augustinian doctrines of grace. He bewailed the fact that the current theology neglected to teach the supreme value of faith and of inward righteousness, that it encouraged men to seek to escape the due reward of sin by means of Indulgences, instead of exhorting them to practise that inward repentance which belongs to every genuine Christian life. It was at this stage of his own inward religious development that Luther felt himself forced to stand forth in public in opposition to the sale of Indulgences in Germany.

Luther had become much more than a professor of theology by this time. He had become a power in Wittenberg. His lectures seemed like a revelation of the Scriptures to the Wittenberg students; grave burghers from the town matriculated at the University in order to attend his classes; his fame gradually spread, and students began to flock from all parts of Germany to the small, poor, and remote town; and the Elector grew proud of his University and of the man who had given it such a position. In these earlier years of his professoriate Luther undertook the duties of the preacher in the town church in Wittenberg. He became a great preacher, able to touch the conscience and bring men to amend their lives. Like all great preachers of the day who were in earnest he denounced prevalent sins; he deplored the low standard set by the leaders of the Church in principle and in practice; he declared that religion was not an easy thing; that it did not consist in externals; that both sin and true repentance had their roots in the heart; and that until the heart had been made pure all kinds of external purifications were useless. Such a man, occupying the position he had

won, could not keep silent when he saw what he believed to be a great source of moral corruption gathering round him and infecting the people whom he taught daily, and who had selected him as their confessor and the religious guide of their lives.

Luther began his work as a Reformer in an attack on what was called an Indulgence proclaimed in 1513 by Pope Leo X, farmed by Albert of Brandenburg, Archbishop of Mainz, and preached by John Tetzel, a Dominican monk who had been commissioned by Albert to sell for him the "papal letters," as the Indulgence tickets were called. The money raised was to be devoted to the building of St Peter's Church in Rome, and to raise a tomb worthy of the great Apostle who, it was said, lay in a Roman grave. People had come to be rather sceptical about the destination of moneys raised by Indulgences; but the buyers had their "papal letters," and it did not much matter to them where the money went after it had left their pockets. The seller of Indulgences had generally a magnificent welcome when he entered a German town. He drew near it in the centre of a procession with the Bull announcing the Indulgence, carried before him on a cloth of gold and velvet, and all the priests and monks of the town, the Burgomaster and Town Council, the teachers and the school-children and a crowd of citizens went out to meet him with banners and lighted candles, and escorted him into the town singing hymns. When the gates were reached all the bells began to ring, the church-organs were played, the crowd, with the commissary in their midst, streamed into the principal church, where a great red cross was erected and the Pope's banner displayed. Then followed sermons and speeches by the commissary and his attendants extolling the Indulgence, narrating its wonderful virtues, and inviting the people to buy. The Elector of Saxony had refused to allow the commissary to enter his territories; but the commissary could approach most parts of the Elector's dominions without actually crossing the boundaries. Tetzel had come to Juterbogk in Magdeburg territory and Zerbst in Anhalt, and had opened the sale of Indulgences there; and people from Wittenberg had gone to these places and made purchases. They had brought their "papal letters" to Luther and had demanded that he should acknowledge their efficacy. He had refused; the buyers had complained to Tetzel and the commissary had uttered threats; Luther felt himself in great perplexity. The Indulgence, and the addresses by which it was commended, he knew, were doing harm to poor souls; he got the letter of instructions given to Tetzel by his employer, the Archbishop of Mainz, and his heart waxed wroth against it. Still at the basis of the Indulgence, bad as it was, Luther thought that there was a great truth; that it is the business of the Church to declare the free and sovereign grace of God apart from all human satisfactions.

The practice of Indulgences was, in his days, universal and permeated the whole Church life of the times. A large number of the pious

associations among laymen, which formed so marked a feature of the fifteenth century piety, were founded on ideas that lay at the basis of the practice of granting Indulgences. Pious Christians of the fifteenth century accepted the religious machinery of their Church as unquestioningly and as quietly as they did the laws of nature. That machinery included among other things an inexhaustible treasury of good works—of prayers, fastings, mortifications of all kinds—which holy men and women had done, and which might be of service to others, if the Pope could only be persuaded to transfer them. When a pious confraternity was formed, the Pope, it was believed, could transfer to the credit of the community a mass of prayers, almsgivings, and other ecclesiastical good deeds, all of which became for the members of the confraternity what a bank advance is to a man starting in business. Some of these associations bought their spiritual treasure from the Pope for so much cash, but there was not always any buying or selling. There was none in the celebrated association of *St Ursula's Schifflein,* to which so many devout people, the Elector himself included, belonged. Probably little paying of cash took place in the thirty-two pious confraternities of which Dr Pfeffinger, the trusted Councillor of the Elector Frederick, was a member. The machinery of the Church, however, secured this advantage that, if by any accident the members of the association failed in praying as they had promised, they had always this transferred treasure to fall back upon. There could be little difference in principle between the Pope transferring a mass of spiritual benefits to a pious brotherhood, and his handing over an indefinite amount to the Archbishop of Mainz to be disposed of, as the prelate thought fit, through Tetzel or others.

Moreover, it must be remembered that in the course of Luther's religious life down to 1517 there are no traces of anything quixotic; and that is a wonderful proof of the simplicity and strength of his character. He had something of a contempt for men who believe that they are born to set the world right; he compared them to a player at ninepins who imagines he can knock down twelve pins when there are only nine standing. It was only after much hesitation and deep distress of mind that he felt compelled to interfere, and it was his intense earnestness in the practical moral life of his townsmen that compelled him to step forward. When he did intervene he went about the matter with a mixture of prudence and courage which were eminently characteristic of the man.

The Castle Church of Wittenberg had always been closely connected with the University, and its doors had been used for publication of important academic documents; notices of public disputations on theological matters, common enough at the time, had doubtless often been seen figuring there. The day of the year which drew the largest concourse of townsmen and strangers to the church was the first of

November, All Saints' Day. It was the anniversary of the consecration of the church, was commemorated by a prolonged series of services, and the benefits of an Indulgence were secured to all who took part in them. At noon on All Saints' Day, Luther nailed his Ninety-five Theses to the door of the church. It was an academic proceeding. A doctor in theology offered to hold a disputation, such was the usual term, for the purpose of explaining the efficacy of the Indulgence. The explanation had ninety-five heads or propositions, all of which "Doctor Martin Luther, theologian," offered to make good against all comers. The subject, judged by the numberless books which had been written upon it, was eminently suitable for debate; the propositions offered were to be matters of discussion; and the author was not supposed, according to the usage of the times, to be definitely committed to the opinions he had expressed; they were simply heads of debate. The document differed however from most academic disputations in this that everyone wished to read it. A duplicate was made in German. Copies of the Latin original and of the German translation were sent to the University printing-house and the presses there could not throw them off fast enough to meet the demand which came from all parts of Germany.

The question which Luther raised in his theses was a difficult one; the theological doctrine of Indulgences was one of the most complicated of the times, and ecclesiastical opinion on many of the points involved was doubtful. It was part of the penitential system of the medieval Church, and had changed from time to time according to the changes in that system. Indeed it may be said that in the matter of Indulgences doctrine had always been framed to justify practices and changes in practice. The beginnings go back a thousand years before the time of Luther.

In the ancient Church serious sins involved separation from the fellowship of Christians, and readmission to the communion was dependent not merely on public confession but also on the manifestation of a true repentance by the performance of certain *satisfactions*, such as the manumission of slaves, prolonged fastings, extensive almsgiving; which were supposed to be well-pleasing in God's sight, and were also the warrant for the community that the penitent might be again received within their midst. It often happened that these satisfactions were mitigated; penitents might fall sick and the prescribed fasting could not be insisted upon without danger of death—in which case the impossible satisfaction could be exchanged for an easier one, or the community might be convinced of the sincerity of the repentance without insisting that the prescribed satisfaction should be fully performed. These exchanges and mitigations are the germs out of which Indulgences grew.

In course of time the public confessions became private confessions made to a priest, and the satisfactions private satisfactions imposed by the confessor. This change involved among other things a wider circle

of sins to be confessed—sins of thought, the sources of sinful actions, brought to light by the confessor's questions; and different satisfactions were imposed at the discretion of the priest corresponding to the sins confessed. This led to the construction of penitentiaries containing lists of penances supposed to be proportionate to the sins. In many cases the penances were very severe and extended over a long course of years. From the seventh century there arose a system of commutations of penances. A penance of several years' practice of fasting might be commuted into saying so many prayers or psalms, giving prescribed alms or even into a money fine—and in this last case the analogy of the *Wergeld* of the Germanic codes was frequently followed. This new custom commonly took the form that anyone who visited a prescribed church on a day that was named and gave a contribution to the funds of the church had his penance shortened by one-seventh, one-third, one-half, as the case might be. This was in every case a commutation of a penance which had been imposed according to the regulations of the Church (*relaxatio de injuncta poenitentià*). This power of commuting imposed penance was usually supposed to be in the hands of Bishops, and was used by them to provide funds for the building of their great churches. But priests for a time also thought themselves entitled to follow the episcopal example; and did so until the great abuse of the system made the Church insist that the power should be strictly kept in episcopal hands. Thus the real origin of Indulgences is to be found in the relaxation by the Church of a portion of the ecclesiastical penalties imposed according to regular custom.

Three conceptions, however, combined to effect a series of changes in the character of Indulgences, all of which were in operation in the beginning of the thirteenth century. These were the formulation of the thought of a Treasury of merits, the change of the institution of penance into the Sacrament of Penance, and the distinction between attrition and contrition. The two former led to the belief that the Pope alone had the power to grant Indulgences—the treasure needed a guardian to prevent its being squandered; and, when Indulgences were judged to be extra-sacramental and a matter of jurisdiction and not of Orders, they belonged to the Pope, whose jurisdiction was supreme.

The conception of a Treasury of merits was first formulated by Alexander of Hales in the thirteenth century, and his ideas were accepted and stated with more precision by the great Schoolmen who followed him Starting with the existing practice in the Church that some penances, such for example as pilgrimages, might be performed vicariously, and bringing together the conceptions that all the faithful are one community, that the good deeds of all the members are the common property of all, that sinners may benefit by the good deeds of their fellows, that the sacrifice of Christ is sufficient to wipe out the sins of all, theologians gradually formulated the doctrine that there was a common storehouse

containing the good deeds of living men, of the saints in heaven, and the inexhaustible merits of Christ, and that the merits there accumulated had been placed in the charge of the Pope and could be dispensed by him to the faithful. The doctrine was not thoroughly defined in the fifteenth century, but it was generally accepted and increased the power and resources of the Pope. It had one immediate consequence on the theory of Indulgences. They were no longer regarded as the substitution of some enjoined work for a canonical penance; they could be looked upon as an absolute equivalent of what was due to God, paid over to Him out of this Treasury of merits.

When the institution became the Sacrament of Penance it was divided into three parts—Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction; and Absolution was made to accompany Confession and therefore to precede Satisfaction, which it had formerly followed. Satisfaction lost its old meaning. It was not the outward sign of inward sorrow, the test of fitness for pardon, and the necessary precedent of Absolution. According to the new theory, Absolution, which followed Confession and preceded Satisfaction, had the effect of removing the whole guilt of the sins confessed, and, with the guilt, the whole of the eternal punishment due; but this cancelling of guilt and of eternal punishment did not open straightway the gates of Heaven. It was thought that the Divine righteousness could not permit the baptised sinner to escape all punishment; so the idea of temporal punishment was introduced, and these *poenae temporales*, strictly distinguished from the eternal, included punishment in Purgatory. The pains of Purgatory therefore were not included in the Absolution, and everyone must suffer these had not God in His mercy provided an alternative in temporal Satisfactions. This gave rise to a great uncertainty; for who could have the assurance that the priest in imposing the Satisfaction or penance had calculated rightly and had assigned the equivalent which the righteousness of God demanded? It was here that the new idea of Indulgences came in to aid the faithful. Indulgences in the sense of relaxations of imposed penance went into the background, and the valuable Indulgence was what would secure against the pains of Purgatory. Thus in the opinion of Alexander of Hales, of Bonaventura, and above all of Thomas Aquinas, the real value of Indulgences is that they procure the remission of penalties after Contrition, Confession, and Absolution, whether these penalties have been imposed by the priest or not; and when the uncertainty of the imposed penalties is considered, Indulgences are most valuable with regard to the unimposed penalties; the priest might make a mistake, but God does not.

While, as has been seen, Indulgences were always related to Satisfactions and changed in character with the changes introduced into the meaning of these, they were not less closely affected by the distinction

which came to be drawn between Attrition and Contrition. Until the thirteenth century it was always held that Contrition or a condition of real sorrow for sin was the one thing taken into account in the according of pardon to the sinner. The theologians of that century however began to make a distinction between Contrition, or godly sorrow, and Attrition, a certain amount of sorrow which might arise from a variety of causes of a more or less unworthy nature It was held that this Attrition, though of itself too imperfect to win the pardon of God, could become perfected through the Confession heard by the priest and the Absolution administered by him. When this idea was placed in line with the thoughts developed as to the nature of the Sacrament of Penance, it followed that the weaker the form of sorrow and the greater the sins confessed and absolved, the heavier were the temporal penalties demanded by the righteousness of God. Indulgences appealed strongly to the indifferent Christian who knew that he had sinned, and who knew at the same time that his sorrow did not amount to Contrition. His conscience, however weak, told him that he could not sin with perfect impunity and that something more was needed than his perfunctory confession and the absolution of the priest. He felt that he must make some amends; that he must perform some satisfying act, or obtain an Indulgence at some cost to himself. *Hence, for the ordinary indifferent Christian Attrition,* Confession, and Indulgence, stood forth as the three great heads of the scheme of the Church for his salvation.

This doctrine of Attrition and its applications had not the undivided support of the Church of the later Middle Ages, but it was the doctrine which was taught by most of the Scotist divines who took the lead in theological thinking during these times. It was taught in its most pronounced form by such a representative man as John von Palz, who was professor of theology in the Erfurt monastery when Luther entered upon his monastic career; it was preached by the Indulgence sellers; it was specially valuable in securing good sales of Indulgences and therefore in increasing the papal profits. It lay at the basis of that whole doctrine and practice of Indulgences which confronted Luther when he felt himself compelled to attack them.

The practice of Indulgences, on whatever theory they were upheld, had enmeshed the whole penitentiary system of the Church in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. The papal power was at first sparingly used. It is true that in 1095 Pope Urban II promised an Indulgence to the Crusaders such as had never before been heard of—namely, a plenary Indulgence or a complete remission of all imposed canonical penances—but it was not until the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries that Indulgences were lavished by the Pope even more unsparingly than they had been previously by the Bishops. From the beginning of the thirteenth century they were promised in order to find recruits for wars against heretics, such as the Albigenses, against

opponents of papal political schemes—in short to recruit the papal armies for wars of all kinds. They were granted freely to the religious Orders, either for the benefits of the members or as rewards to the faithful who visited their churches and made contributions to their funds. They were bestowed on special churches or cathedrals, or on altars in churches, and had the effect of endowments. They were given to hospitals, and for the rebuilding, repair, and upkeep of bridges—the Elector had one attached to his bridge at Torgau and had employed Tetzel to preach its benefits. They were attached to special collections of relics to be earned by the faithful who visited the shrines. In short it is difficult to say to what they were not given and for what money-getting purpose they had not been employed. The Fuggers amassed much of their wealth from commissions received in managing these Indulgences. But perhaps it may be said that the Indulgence system reached its height in the great Jubilee Indulgences which were granted by successive Popes beginning with Boniface VIII. They were first bestowed on pilgrims who actually visited Rome and prayed at prescribed times within certain churches; then, the same Indulgence came to be bestowed on persons who were willing to give at least what a journey to Rome would have cost them; and in the end they could be had on much easier terms. Wherever Indulgences are met with they are surrounded with a sordid system of money-getting; and, as Luther said in a sermon which he preached on the subject before he had prepared his Theses, they were a very grievous instrument to be placed in the hands of avarice.

The theories of theologians had always followed the custom of the Church; Indulgences existed and had to be explained. This is the attitude of the two great Schoolmen, Bonaventura and Thomas Aquinas, who did more than any other theologians to provide a theological basis for the practice. The practice itself had altered and new explanations had been made to suit the alterations. It is needless to say that the theological explanations did not always agree, and that sometimes the terms of the proclamation of an Indulgence went beyond the theories of many of the theological defenders of the system. To take one instance. Did an Indulgence give remission for the guilt of sin or only for certain penalties attached to sinful deeds? This is a matter still keenly debated. The theory adopted by all defenders of Indulgences who have written on the subject since the Council of Trent is that guilt (*culpa*) and eternal punishment are dealt with in the Sacrament of Penance; and that Indulgences have to do with temporal punishments only, including under that phrase the penalties of Purgatory. It is also to be admitted that this modern opinion is confirmed by the most eminent medieval theologians before the Council of Trent. Those admissions, however, do not settle the question. Medieval theology did not create Indulgences; it only followed and tried to justify the practices of Popes

and the Roman Curia—a confessedly difficult task. The question still remains whether the official documents did not assert that Indulgences did remove guilt as well as penalty of the temporal kind. If documents granting Indulgences, published after the Sacrament of Penance had been formulated, be examined, it will be found that many of them, while proclaiming the Indulgence and its benefits, make no mention of the necessity of previous confession and priestly absolution; that others expressly assert that the Indulgence confers a remission of guilt (*culpa*) as well as penalty; and that very many, especially in the Jubilee times, use language which inevitably led intelligent laymen (Dante for example) to believe that the Indulgence remitted the guilt as well as the penalties of actual sins; and when all due allowance has been made it is very difficult to avoid the conclusion that Indulgences had been declared on the highest authority to be efficacious for the removal of the guilt of sins in the presence of God.

Luther however approached the whole question not from the side of theological theory but from its practical moral effect on the minds of the common people, who were not theologians and on whom refined distinctions were thrown away; and the evidence that the people believed that the Indulgence remitted the guilt as well as the penalties of sins is overwhelming. Putting aside the statements or views of Hus, Wiclif, and the *Piers Plowman* series of poems, contemporary chroniclers are found describing Indulgences given for crusades or in times of Jubilee as remissions of guilt as well as of penalty; contemporary preachers dwelt on the distinction between the partial and the plenary Indulgence, asserted that the latter meant remission of guilt as well as of penalty, and explained their statements by insisting that the plenary Indulgence included within it the Sacrament of Penance; the popular guide-books written for pilgrims to Rome and Compostella spread the popular ideas about Indulgences, and this without any interference from the ecclesiastical authorities. The *Mirabilia Romae*, a very celebrated guide-book for pilgrims to Rome, which had gone through nineteen Latin and twelve German editions before the year 1500, says expressly that every pilgrim who visits the Lateran has forgiveness of all sins, of guilt as well as of penalty, and makes the same statement about the virtues of the Indulgences given to other shrines. The popular belief was so well acknowledged that even Councils had to excuse themselves from having fostered it, and did so by laying the blame on the preachers and sellers of Indulgences, or, like the Council of Constance, impeached the Pope and compelled him to confess that he had granted Indulgences for the remission of guilt as well as of penalty. This widespread popular belief justified the attitude taken up by Luther.

But if it be granted that the intelligent belief of the Church as found in the writings of its most respected theologians was that the Indulgence remitted the penalty and not the guilt of sin, it is well to

notice what this meant. Since the formulation of the doctrine of the Sacrament of Penance, the theory had been that all guilt of sin and all eternal punishment were remitted in the priestly Absolution which followed the confession of the penitent. The Sacrament of Penance had abolished guilt and hell. But there remained actual sins to be punished because the righteousness of God demanded it, and this was done in the temporal pains of Purgatory. The "common man," if he thought at all on the matter, might be excused if he considered that guilt and hell, if taken away by the one hand, were restored by the other, and that the whole series of questions discussed by the theologians amounted to little more than dialectical fencing with phrases. He was taught and he believed that punishment awaited him for his sins—and a temporal punishment which might last thousands of years was not very different from an eternal one in his eyes. With these thoughts the Indulgence was offered to him as a sure way of easing his conscience and avoiding the punishment which he knew to be deserved. He had only to pay a sum of money and perform the canonical good deed enjoined, whatever it might be, and he had the remission of his punishment and the sense that God's justice was satisfied. It was this practical ethical effect of the Indulgences, and not the theological explanations about them, which stirred Luther to make his protest.

Luther's Theses, in their lack of precise theological definition and of logical arrangement, are singularly unlike what might have been expected from a professional theologian; and they contain repetitions which might easily have been avoided. They are not a clearly reasoned statement of a theological doctrine; still less are they the programme of a scheme of reformation. They are simply ninety-five sledge-hammer blows directed against the most flagrant ecclesiastical abuse of the age. They look like the utterance of a man who was in close contact with the people, who had been shocked at statements made by the preachers of the Indulgence, who had read a good deal of the current theological opinions published in defence of Indulgences, and had noted several views which he longed to contradict as publicly as possible. They are prefaced with the expression of love and desire to elucidate the truth. They read as if they were addressed to the "common man" and appealed to his common sense of spiritual things. Luther had told the assembly of clergy, who met at Leitzkau in 1512 to discuss the affairs of the Church, that every true reformation must begin with individual men, and that it must have for its centre the regenerate heart, for its being an awakening faith, and for its inspiration the preaching of a pure Gospel.

The note which he sounded in this, his earliest utterance which has come down to us, is re-echoed in the Theses. It is heard in the opening sentences. The penitence which Christ requires is something more than a momentary expression of sorrow; it is an habitual thing which lasts continuously during the whole of the believer's life; outward

deeds of penitence are necessary to manifest the real penitence which is inward and which is the source of a continuous mortification of the flesh; confession is also a necessary thing because the true penitent must be prepared to humble himself; but the one thing needful is the godly contrition of the heart. In the Theses Luther makes six distinct assertions about Indulgences and their efficacy:—(1) Indulgence is and can only be the remission of a canonical penalty; the Church can remit what the Church has imposed; it cannot remit what God has imposed. (2) An Indulgence can never remit guilt; the Pope himself is unable to do this. (3) It cannot remit the divine punishment for sin—God keeps that in His own hands. (4) It has no application to souls in Purgatory; for penalties imposed by the Church can only refer to the living; death dissolves them; all that the Pope can do for souls in Purgatory is by prayer and not by any power of keys. (5) The Christian who has true repentance has already received pardon from God altogether apart from an Indulgence and does not need it; and Christ demands this true repentance from everyone. (6) The Treasure of Merits has never been properly defined, and is not understood by the people; it cannot be the merits of Christ and the Saints, because these act without any intervention from the Pope; it can mean nothing more than that the Pope, having the power of the keys, can remit Satisfactions imposed by the Church, the true treasure of merits is the holy Gospel of the grace of God.

The Theses had a circulation which for the times was unprecedented. They were known all over Germany, Myconius assures us, within a fortnight. This popularity was no doubt partly due to the growing dislike of papal methods of gaining money; but there must have been more than that in it; Luther was only uttering aloud what thousands of pious Germans had been thinking. The lack of all theological treatment must have increased their popularity. The sentences were plain and easily understood. They kept within the field of simple religious and moral truth. Their effect was so immediate that the sales of Indulgences began to decline. The Theses appealed to all those who had been brought up in the simple evangelical family piety and who had not forsaken it; and they appealed also to all who shared that non-ecclesiastical piety which had been rising and spreading during the last decades of the fifteenth century. Both these forces, purely religious, at once rallied round the author.

Theologians were provokingly silent about the Theses. Luther's intimate friends, who agreed with his opinions, thought that he had acted with great rashness. His Bishop had told him that he saw nothing to object to in his declarations, but advised him to write no more on the subject. Before the end of the year Tetzel published Counter-Theses, written for him by Conrad Wimpina, of Frankfort on the Oder. John Eck (Maier), by far the ablest of Luther's opponents, had in circulation, though probably unpublished, an answer, entitled *Obelisks*, which was in

Luther's hands as early as March 4, 1518, and was probably answered by Luther on March 24, although the answer was not published until August. The Theses had been sent to Rome by the Archbishop of Mainz. The Pope, Leo X, thinking that they represented a merely monkish quarrel, contented himself with asking the General of the Augustinian Eremites to keep things quiet among his monks. But at Rome, Silvester Mazzolini, called Prierias (from his birthplace, Prierio), a Dominican, Papal Censor for the Roman Province and an Inquisitor, was profoundly dissatisfied with Luther's declarations, and answered them in a book entitled *A Dialogue about the power of the Pope, against the Presumptuous Conclusions of Martin Luther.* In April, 1518, the Augustinian Eremites held their usual annual chapter at Heidelberg, and Luther went there in spite of many warnings that his life was not safe out of Wittenberg. At these general chapters some time was always spent in theological discussion, and Luther at last heard his Theses temperately discussed. He found the opposition to his views much stronger than he had expected, but the real discussion so pleased him that he returned to Wittenberg much strengthened and comforted. On his return he began a general answer to his opponents. The book, *Resolutiones*, was probably the most carefully prepared of all Luther's writings. It was meditated over long and rewritten several times. It contains an interesting and partly biographical dedication to Staupitz; it is addressed to the Pope; it sets forth a detailed defence of the author's ninety-five conclusions on the subject of Indulgences.

If we concern ourselves with the central position in the attacks made on Luther's Theses it will be found that they amount to this; that Indulgences are simply a particular case of the use of the ordinary power placed in the hands of the Pope and are whatever the Pope means them to be, and that no discussion about the precise kind of efficacy which may be in their use is to be tolerated. The Roman Church is virtually the Universal Church, and the Pope is practically the Roman Church. Hence as the representative of the Roman Church, which in turn represents the Universal Church, the Pope, when he acts officially, cannot err. Official decisions are given in actions as well as in words, and custom has the force of law. Therefore whoever objects to such long-established customs as Indulgences is a heretic and does not deserve to be heard. Luther, in his Theses and still more in his *Resolutiones*, had repudiated all the additions made to the theory and practice of Indulgences founded on papal action during the three centuries past, and all the scholastic subtleties which had attempted to justify those practices. The answers of his opponents, and especially of Prierias, had barred all such discussion by declaring that ecclesiastical usages were matters of faith, and by interposing the official infallibility of the Bishop of Rome. Had the question been one of intellectual speculation only, it is probable that the Pope would not have placed himself behind his

too zealous supporters. The Church was accustomed to the presence of various schools of theology with differing opinions; but the Curia had always been extremely sensitive about Indulgences; they were the source of an enormous revenue, and anything which checked their sale would have caused financial embarrassment. Hence it is scarcely to be wondered at that Pope Leo summoned Luther to Rome to answer for his attack on the system of Indulgences.

This sudden summons (July, 1518) to appear before the Inquisitorial Office could be represented as an affront to Wittenberg; and Luther wrote to Spalatin, the Elector's chaplain, and the chief link between his Court and the University, suggesting that German princes ought to defend the rights of German universities attacked in his person. Spalatin immediately wrote to the Elector Frederick and to the Emperor Maximilian, both of whom were at Augsburg at the time. The Elector was jealous of the rights of his University, and he had a high regard for Luther, who had done so much to make his University the flourishing seat of learning it had become. The Emperor's keen political vision discerned a useful if obscure ally in the young German theologian. "Luther is sure to begin a game with the priests," he said; "the Elector should take good care of that monk, for he will be useful to us some day." So the Pope was urged to suspend the summons and grant Luther a trial on German soil. The matter was left in the hands of the Pope's Legate in Germany, Cajetan (Thomas de Vio), and Luther was ordered to present himself before that official at Augsburg.

When Luther had nailed his Theses to the door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg he had been a solitary monk driven imperiously by his conscience to act alone and afraid to compromise any of his friends. It must have been with very different feelings that he started on his journey to meet the Cardinal-Legate at Augsburg. He knew that the Theses had won for him numberless sympathisers. His correspondence shows that his University was with him to a man. The students were enthusiastic and thronged his class-room. His theology—theology based on the Holy Scriptures and on Augustine and Bernard—was spreading rapidly through the convents of his Order in Germany and even in the Netherlands. Melanchthon had come to Wittenberg on the 25th of August; he had begun to lecture on Homer and on the Epistle to Titus; and Luther was exulting in the thought that his University would soon show German scholarship able to match itself against the Italian. The days were fast disappearing, he wrote, when the Romans could cheat the Germans with their intrigues, trickeries, and treacheries; treat them as blockheads and boors; and gull them continuously and shamelessly. As for the Pope, he was not to be moved by what pleased or displeased his Holiness. The Pope was a man as Luther himself was; and many a Pope had been guilty not merely of errors but of crimes. At quieter moments, however, he was oppressed with the thought that it had been

laid on him who hated publicity, who loved to keep quiet and teach his students and preach to his people, to stand forth as he had felt compelled to do. The patriot, the prophet of a new era, the humble, almost shrinking Christian monk—all these characters appear in his correspondence with his intimates in the autumn of 1518.

The Diet, which had just closed when Luther reached Augsburg, had witnessed some brilliant scenes. A Cardinal's hat had been bestowed on the Archbishop of Mainz with all gorgeous solemnities; the aged Emperor Maximilian had been solemnly presented with the pilgrimage symbols of a hat and a dagger, both blessed by the Pope. His Holiness invited Germany to unite in a crusade against the Turks, and the Emperor would have willingly appeared as the champion of Christendom. But the German Princes, spiritual and secular, were in no mood to fulfil any demands made from Rome. The spirit of revolt had not yet taken active shape, but it could be expressed in a somewhat sullen refusal to agree to the Pope's proposals. The Emperor recognised the symptoms, and wrote to Rome advising the Pope to be cautious how he dealt with Luther His advice was thrown away. When, after wearying delays, the monk had his first interview with the Cardinal-Legate, he was told that no discussion could be permitted, private or public, until Luther had recanted his heresies, had promised not to repeat them, and had given assurance that he would not trouble the peace of the Church in the future. Being pressed to name the heresies, the adroit theologian named two opinions which had wide-reaching consequences—the 58th conclusion of the Theses and the statement in the *Resolutiones* that the sacraments were not efficacious apart from faith in the recipient. There was some discussion notwithstanding the Cardinal's declaration; but in the end Luther was ordered to recant or depart. He departed; and, after an appeal from the Pope ill-informed to the Pope to be well-informed, and also an appeal to a General Council, he returned to Wittenberg. There he wrote out an account of his interview with the Legate—the *Acta Augustana*—which was published and read all over Germany.

The interview between the Cardinal-Legate and Luther at Augsburg almost dates the union between the new religious movement, the growing national restlessness under Roman domination, and the humanist intellectual revolt. A well-known and pious monk, an esteemed teacher in a University which he was making famous throughout Germany, an earnest moralist who had proposed to discuss the efficacy of a system of Indulgences which manifestly had some detrimental sides, had been told, in the most peremptory way, that he must recant, and that without explanation or discussion. German patriots saw in the proceeding another instance of the contemptuous way in which Rome always treated Germany; humanists believed it to be tyrannical stifling of the truth even worse than the dealings with Reuchlin; and both humanist and patriot believed it to be another

instance of the Roman greed for German gold. As for Luther himself he daily expected a Bull from Rome excommunicating him as a heretic.

But the political condition of affairs in Germany was too delicate—the country was on the eve of the choice of a King of the Romans, and possibly of an imperial election—and the support of the Elector of Saxony too important, for the Pope to proceed rashly in the condemnation of Luther which had been pronounced by his Legate at Augsburg. It was resolved to send a special delegate to Germany to report upon the condition of affairs there. Care was taken to select a man who would be acceptable to the Elector. Charles von Miltitz belonged to a noble Saxon family; he was one of the Pope's chamberlains, and for some years had been the Elector's agent at Rome. His Holiness did more to gain over Luther's protector. Frederick had long wished for that mark of the Pope's friendship, the Golden Rose, and had privately asked for it through Miltitz himself The Golden Rose was now sent to him with a gracious letter Miltitz was also furnished with formal papal letters to the Elector, to his councillors, to the magistrates of Wittenberg, and to several others—letters in which Luther figured as "a child of Satan." The phrase was probably forgotten when Leo wrote to Luther some time later and addressed him as his dear son.

Miltitz had no sooner reached Germany than he saw that the state of affairs there was utterly unknown to the Roman Curia. It was not a man that had to be dealt with, but the slowly increasing movement of a nation. He felt this during the progress of his journey. When he reached Augsburg and Nürnberg, and found himself among his old friends and kinsmen, three out of five were strongly in favour of Luther. So impressed was he with the state of feeling in the country that before he entered Saxony he "put the Golden Rose in a sack with the Indulgences," to use the words of his friend, the jurist Scheurl, laid aside all indications of the papal Commissioner, and travelled like a private nobleman. Tetzel was summoned to meet him, but the unhappy man declared that his life was not safe if he left his convent. Miltitz felt that it would be better to have private interviews before producing his official credentials. He had one with Luther, where he set himself to discover how much Luther would really yield, and found that the Reformer was not the obstinate man he had been led to suppose. Luther was prepared to yield much. He would write a submissive letter to the Pope; he would publish an advice to the people to honour the Roman Church; and he would say that Indulgences were useful in remitting canonical Satisfactions. All of which Luther did. But the Roman Curia did not support Miltitz, and the Commissioner had to reckon with John Eck of Ingolstadt, who wished to silence his old friend by scholastic dialectic and procure his condemnation

as a heretic. Nor was Luther quite convinced of Miltitz' honesty. When the Commissioner dismissed him with a kiss, he could not help asking himself, he tells us, whether it was a Judas-kiss. He had been re-examining his convictions about the faith which justifies, and trying to see their consequences; and he had been studying the Papal Decretals, and discovering to his amazement and indignation the frauds that many of them contained and the slender foundation which they really gave for the pretensions of the Papacy. He had been driven to these studies. The papal theologians had confronted him with the absolute authority of the Pope. Luther was forced to investigate the evidence for this authority. His conclusion was that the papal supremacy had been forced on Germany on the strength of a collection of decretals; and that many of these decretals would not bear investigation. It is hard to say, judging from his correspondence, whether this discovery brought joy or sorrow to Luther. He had accepted the Pope's supremacy; it was one of the strongest of his inherited beliefs, and now under the combined influence of historical study, of the opinions of the early Fathers, and of Scripture, it was slowly dissolving. He hardly knew where he stood. He was half-terrified, half-exultant at the results of his studies, and the ebb and flow of his own feelings were answered by the anxieties of his immediate circle of friends. A public disputation might clear the air, and he almost feverishly welcomed Eck's challenge to dispute publicly with him at Leipzig on the primacy and supremacy of the Pope.

Contemporary witnesses describe the common country carts which conveyed the Wittenberg theologians to the capital of Ducal Saxony, the two hundred students with their halberts and helmets who escorted their honoured professors into what was an enemy's country, the crowded inns and lodging-houses where the master of the house kept a man with a halbert standing beside every table to prevent disputes becoming bloody quarrels, the densely packed hall in Duke George's palace, the citizens' guard, the platform with its two chairs for the disputants and seats for academic and secular dignitaries, and the two theologians, both sons of peasants, met to protect the old or to cleave a way for the new. Eck's intention was to force Luther to make such a declaration as would justify him in denouncing his opponent as a partisan of the Bohemian heresy. The audience swayed with a wave of excitement, and Duke George placed his arms akimbo, wagged his long beard, and said aloud, "God help us! the plague!" when Luther was forced, in spite of protestations, to acknowledge that not all the opinions of Wiclif and Hus were wrong.

So far as the fight in dialectic had gone Eck was victorious; he had compelled Luther, as he thought, to declare himself, and there remained only the Bull of Excommunication, and to rid Germany of a pestilent heretic. He was triumphant. Luther was correspondingly

downcast and returned to Wittenberg full of melancholy forebodings. But some victories are worse than defeats. Eck had done what the more politic Miltitz had wished to avoid. He had made Luther a central figure round which all the smouldering discontent of Germany with Rome could rally, and had made it possible for the political movement to become impregnated with the passion of religious conviction. The Leipzig Disputation was perhaps the most important episode in the whole course of Luther's career. It made him see clearly for the first time what lay in his opposition to Indulgences; and it made others see it also. It was after Leipzig that the younger German humanists rallied round Luther to a man; the burghers saw that religion and liberty were not opposing but allied forces; that there was room for a common effort to create a Germany for the Germans. The feeling awakened gave new life to Luther; sermons, pamphlets, controversial writings from his tireless pen flooded the land and were read eagerly by all classes of the population.

Three of these writings stand forth pre-eminently: *The Liberty of a Christian Man; To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation concerning the reformation of the Christian Commonwealth;* and *On the Babylonish Captivity of the Church.* They were all written during the year 1520, after three years spent in controversy, and at a time when Luther felt that he had completely broken with Rome. They are known in Germany as the three great Reformation treatises. The tract on Christian liberty was probably the last published (October, 1520), but it contains the principles which underlie the two others. It is a brief statement, free from all theological subtleties, of the priesthood of all believers, which is a consequence of the fact of justification by faith alone. The first part shows that everything which a Christian has can be traced back to his faith; if he has faith, he has all: if he has not faith, he has nothing. The second part shows that everything which a Christian man does must come from his faith; it is necessary to use all the ceremonies of divine service which have been found helpful for spiritual education; perhaps to fast and practise mortifications; but these are not good things in the sense that they make a man good; they are all signs of faith and are to be practised with joy, because they are done to the God to Whom faith unites man.

Luther applied those principles to the reformation of the Christian Church in his book on its "Babylonish Captivity." The elaborate sacramental system of the Roman Church is subjected to a searching criticism, in which Luther shows that the Roman Curia has held the Church of God in bondage to human traditions which run counter to plain messages and promises in the Word of God. He declares himself in favour of the marriage of the clergy, and asserts that divorce is in some cases lawful.

The Appeal *To the Christian Nobility of the German Nation* made the greatest immediate impression. Contemporaries called it a trumpet blast. It was a call to all Germany to unite against Rome. It was written in haste, but must have been long meditated upon. Luther wrote the introduction on the 23rd of June (1520); the printers worked as he wrote; it was finished and published about the middle of August, and by the 18th of the month 4000 copies had gone into all parts of Germany and the printers could not supply the demand. This Appeal was the manifesto of a revolution sent forth by a true leader of men, able to concentrate the attack and direct it to the enemy's one vital spot. It grasped the whole situation; it summed up with vigour and directness all the grievances which had hitherto been stated separately and weakly; it embodied every proposal of reform, however incomplete, and set it in its proper place in one combined scheme. All the parts were welded together by a simple and direct religious faith, and made living by the moral earnestness which pervaded the whole.

Reform had been impossible, the Appeal says, because the walls behind which Rome lay entrenched had been left standing—walls of straw and paper, but in appearance formidable fortifications. If the temporal Powers demanded reforms, they were told that the Spiritual Power was superior and controlling. If the Spiritual Power itself was attacked from the side of Scripture, it was affirmed that no one could say what Scripture really meant but the Pope. If a Council was called for to make the reform, men were informed that it was impossible to summon a Council without the leave of the Pope. Now this pretended Spiritual Power which made reform impossible was a delusion. The only real spiritual power existing belonged to the whole body of believers in virtue of the spiritual priesthood bestowed upon them by Christ Himself. The clergy were distinguished from the laity, not by an indelible character imposed upon them in a divine mystery called ordination, but because they were set in the commonwealth to do a particular work. If they neglected the work they were there to do, the clergy were accountable to the same temporal Powers which ruled the land. The statement that the Pope alone can interpret Scripture is a foolish one; the Holy Scripture is open to all, and can be interpreted by all true believers who have the mind of Christ and come to the Word of God humbly and really seeking enlightenment. When a Council is needed, every individual Christian has a right to do his best to get it summoned, and the temporal Powers are there to represent and enforce his wishes.

The straw walls having been cleared away, the Appeal proceeds with an indictment against Rome. There is in Rome one who calls himself the Vicar of Christ and whose life has small resemblance to that of our Lord and St Peter; for this man wears a triple crown

(a single one does not content him), and keeps up such a state that he requires a larger personal revenue than the Emperor. He has surrounding him a number of men called Cardinals, whose only apparent use is to draw to themselves the revenues of the richest convents and benefices and to spend this money in keeping up the state of a wealthy monarch in Rome. In this way, and through other holders of German benefices who live as hangers-on at the papal court, Rome takes from Germany a sum of 300,000 gulden annually,—more than is paid to the Emperor. Rome robs Germany in many other ways, most of them fraudulent—*annates*, absolution money, &c. The chicanery used to get possession of German benefices; the exactions on the bestowal of the *pallium*; the trafficking in exemptions and permissions to evade laws ecclesiastical and moral, are all trenchantly described. The plan of reform sketched includes the complete abolition of the supremacy of the Pope over the State; the creation of a national German Church with an ecclesiastical national Council, to be the final court of appeal for Germany and to represent the German Church as the Diet did the German State; some internal religious reforms, such as the limitation of the number of pilgrimages, which are destroying morality and creating in men a distaste for honest work; reductions in the mendicant Orders, which are mere incentives to a life of beggary; the inspection of all convents and nunneries and permission given to those who are dissatisfied with their monastic lives to return to the world; the limitation of ecclesiastical festivals which are too often nothing but scenes of gluttony, drunkenness, and debauchery; a married priesthood and an end put to the universal and degrading concubinage of the German parish priests. The Appeal closes with some solemn words addressed to the luxury and licensed immorality of the cities.

None of Luther's writings produced such an instantaneous, widespread, and powerful effect as did this Appeal. It went circulating all over Germany, uniting all classes of society in a way hitherto unknown. It was an effectual antidote, so far as the majority of the German people was concerned, to the Bull of Excommunication which had been prepared in Rome by Cajetan, Prierias, and Eck, and had been published there in June, 1520. Eck was entrusted with the publication of the Bull in Germany, where it did not command much respect. It had been drafted by men who had been Luther's opponents, and suggested the gratification of private animosity rather than calm judicial examination and rejection of heretical opinion. The feeling grew stronger when it was discovered that Eck, having received the power to do so, had inserted the names of Adelmann, Pirkheimer, Spengler, and Carlstadt along with that of Luther—all five personal enemies. The German Bishops seemed to be unwilling to allow the publication of the Bull within their districts. Later the publication became dangerous, so threatening was the attitude of the crowds. Luther, on his part, burnt the Bull publicly; and

electrified Germany by the deed. Rome had now done its utmost to get rid of Luther by way of ecclesiastical repression. If he was to be overthrown, if the new religious movement and the national uprising which enclosed it, were to be stifled, this could only be done by the aid of the highest secular power. The Roman Curia turned to the Emperor.

Maximilian had died suddenly on the 12th of January, 1519. After some months of intriguing, the papal diplomacy being very tortuous, his grandson, Charles V, the young King of Spain, was unanimously chosen to be his successor (June 28). Troubles in Spain prevented him from leaving that country at once to take possession of his new dignities. He was crowned at Aachen on the 23rd of October, 1520, and opened his first German Diet on January 22, 1521.

The proceedings of this Diet were of great importance apart from its relation to Luther; but to the common people of Germany, to the papal Nuncios, Aleander and Caraccioli, and to the foreign envoys, the issues raised by Luther's revolt against Rome were the matters of absorbing interest. Girolamo Aleander had been specially selected by Pope Leo X to secure Luther's condemnation by the Emperor. He was a cultivated Churchman, who knew Germany well, and had been in intimate relations with many of the German humanists. His despatches and those of the envoys of England, Spain, and Venice witness to the extraordinary excitement among the people of all classes. Aleander had been in Germany ten years earlier, and had found no people so devoted to the Papacy as the Germans. Now all things were changed. The legion of poor nobles, the German lawyers and canonists, the professors and students, the men of learning and the poets, were all on Luther's side. Most of the monks, a large portion of the clergy, many of the Bishops, supported Luther His friends had the audacity to establish a printing-press in Worms, whence issued quantities of the forbidden writings, which were hawked about in the market-place, on the streets, and even within the Emperor's palace. These books were eagerly bought and read with avidity; large prices were sometimes given for them.

Aleander could not induce the Emperor to consent to Luther's immediate condemnation. Charles must have felt the difficulties of the situation. His position as head of the Holy Roman Empire, the traditional policy of the Hapsburg family, his own deeply rooted personal convictions, which found outcome in the brief statement read to the Princes on the day after Luther's appearance, all go to prove that he had not the slightest sympathy with the Reformer and that he had resolved that he should be condemned. But the Diet's consent was necessary before the imperial ban could be issued; and besides Charles had his own bargain to make with the Pope, and this matter of Luther might help him to make a good one. The Diet resolved that Luther should be heard; a safe-conduct was sent along with the summons to attend; Luther travelled to Worms in what seemed like a triumphal

procession to the angry partisans of the Pope; and on April 16th he appeared before Charles and the Diet. He entered smiling, says Aleander; he looked slowly round the assembly and his face became grave. On a table near where he was placed there was a pile of books. Twenty-five of Luther's writings had been hastily collected by command of the Emperor and placed there. The procedure was entrusted to John Eck, the Official of Trier (to be distinguished from John Eck of Ingolstadt), a man in whom Aleander had much confidence and who was lodged, he says significantly, in the chamber next his. Luther was asked whether the books before him were of his authorship (the names were read over to him), and whether he would retract what he had written in them. He answered, acknowledging the books, but asked for time to consider how to reply to the second question. He was granted delay till the following day; and retired to his lodging.

The evening and the night were a time of terrible depression, conflict, despair, and prayer. Before the dawn came the victory had been won, and he felt in a great calm. He was sent for in the evening (April 18); the streets were so thronged that his conductors had to take him by obscure passages to the Diet. There was the same table with the same pile of books. This time Luther was ready with his answer, and his voice had recovered its clear musical note. When asked whether, having acknowledged the books to be his, he was prepared to defend them or to withdraw them, he replied at some length. In substance, it was, that his books were not all of the same kind; in some he had written on faith and morals in a way approved by all, and that it was needless to retract what friends and foes alike approved of; others were written against the Papacy, a system which by teaching and example was ruining Christendom, and that he could not retract these writings, as for the rest, he was prepared to admit that he might have been more violent in his charges than became a Christian, but still he was not prepared to retract them either; but he was ready to listen to anyone who could show that he had erred. The speech was repeated in Latin for the benefit of the Emperor. Then Charles told him through Eck that he was not there to question matters which had been long ago decided and settled by General Councils, and that he must answer plainly whether he meant to retract what he had said contradicting the decisions of the Council of Constance. Luther answered that he must be convinced by Holy Scripture, for he knew that both Pope and Councils had erred; his conscience was fast bound to Holy Scripture, and it was neither safe nor honest to act against conscience. This was said in German and in Latin. The Emperor asked him, through Eck, whether he actually believed that a General Council could err. Luther replied that he did, and could prove it. Eck was about to begin a discussion, but Charles interposed. His interest was evidently confined to the one point of a General Council. Luther was dismissed, the crowd followed him, and a

number of the followers of the Elector of Saxony accompanied him. Aleander tells us that as he left the audience hall he raised his hand in the fashion of the German soldier who had struck a good stroke. He had struck his stroke, and left the hall.

Next day Charles met the princes, and read them a paper in which he had written his own opinion of what ought to be done. The Germans pleaded for delay and negotiations with Luther. This was agreed to, and meetings were held in hopes of arriving at a conference. A commission of eight, representing the Electors, the nobles, and the cities, was appointed to meet with Luther. They were all sincerely anxious to arrive at a working compromise; but the negotiations were in vain. The Emperor's assertion of the infallibility of a General Council, and Luther's phrase, a conscience fast bound to the Holy Scripture, could not be welded together by any diplomacy however sincere. The Word of God was to Luther a living voice speaking to his own soul, it was not to be stifled by the decisions of any Council; Luther was ready to lay down his life, rather than accept any compromise which endangered the Christian liberty which came to men by justifying faith.

The negotiations having failed, the Ban of the Empire was pronounced against Luther. It was dated on the day on which Charles concluded his secret treaty with Pope Leo X, as if to make clear to the Pope the price which he paid for the condemnation of the Reformer. Luther was ordered to quit Worms on April 26th, and his safe-conduct protected him for twenty days, and no longer. At their expiration he was liable to be seized and destroyed as a pestilent heretic. On his journey homewards he was captured by a band of soldiers and taken to the Castle of the Wartburg by order of the Elector of Saxony. This was his "Patmos," where he was to be kept in safety until the troubles were over. His disappearance did not mean that he was no longer a great leader of men; but it marks the time when the Lutheran revolt merges in national opposition to Rome.

CHAPTER V.

NATIONAL OPPOSITION TO ROME IN GERMANY.

THROUGH all the political and religious confusion, which distracted Germany during the period from the Diet of Worms to the Peasants' War, there runs one thread which gives to the story at least a semblance of unity; and that is the attempt and failure of a central government to keep the nation together on the path towards a practical reform in Church and in State. The reform was no less imperative than the obstacles to it were formidable. Germany was little more than a geographical expression, and a vague one withal; it was not a State, it could hardly be called a nation, so deep were its class divisions. Horizontal as well as vertical lines traversed it in every part, and its social strata were no more fused into one nation than its political sections were welded into one organised State. Rival ambitions and conflicting interests might set Prince against Prince, knight against knight, and town against town, but deeper antagonisms ranged knights against Princes and cities, or cities against Princes and knights; they might all conspire against Caesar, or the peasant might rise up against them. Imperial authority was an ineffective shadow brooding over the troubled waters and unable to still the storm. Separatism in every variety of permutation and combination was erected into a principle, and on it was based the Germanic political system.

Yet this warring concourse of atoms felt once and again a common impulse, and adopted on rare occasions a common line of action. With few exceptions the German people were bent on reform of the Church, and with one voice they welcomed the election of Charles V. Nor for the moment was the hope of political salvation entirely quenched. The efforts of Berthold of Mainz and Frederick of Saxony to evolve order out of the chaos had been foiled by the skill of the Emperor Maximilian, and the advent of Luther had been the signal for a fresh eruption of discord. But the urgency of the need produced a correspondingly strong demand for national unity; and at his election Charles was pledged to renew the attempt to create a national government, to maintain a national judicature, and to pursue a national policy. Un-

happily vague aspirations and imperial promises were poor substitutes for political forces, and the forms in which the common feelings of the nation found vent added strength to centrifugal tendencies, and contributed their share to the ruin of unity. The attempt to remodel the Church divided the realm into two persistently hostile camps, and the succession of Charles V secured the throne of the Caesars to a family which was too often ready to sacrifice its national imperial duties to the claims of dynastic ambition.

Seldom has a nation had better cause to repent a fit of enthusiasm than Germany had when it realised the effects of the election of Charles V. Of his rivals Francis I would no doubt have made a worse Emperor, but the choice of Ferdinand—a suggestion made by Margaret of Savoy and peremptorily rejected by Charles himself—or of Frederick of Saxony, would probably have been attended with less disastrous consequences to the German national cause. In personal tastes and sympathies, in the aims he pursued within his German kingdom, and in his foreign policy Charles V was an alien; his ways were not those of his subjects, nor were his thoughts their thoughts; he could neither speak the German language, nor read the German mind. Nurtured from birth in the Burgundian lands of his father, he at first regarded the world from a purely Burgundian point of view and sorely offended his Spanish subjects by his neglect of their interests in concluding the Treaty of Noyon (1516). But the Flemish aspect of his Court and his policy rapidly changed under southern influence, and the ten years of his youth (1517-20 and 1522-9) which he spent in Spain developed the Spanish tastes and feelings which he derived from his mother Juana. His mind grew ever more Spanish in sympathy, and this mental evolution was more and more clearly reflected in Charles' dynastic policy. So far as it was affected by national considerations, those considerations became ever more Spanish; the Colossus which bestrode the world gradually turned its face southwards, and it was to Spain and not to the land of his birth that Charles retired to die.

From this development Germany could not fail to suffer. German soldiers helped to win Pavia and to desecrate Rome, but their blood was shed in vain so far as the fatherland was concerned. Charles' conquests in Italy, made in the name of the German Empire and supported by German imperial claims, went to swell the growing bulk of the Spanish monarchy, and when he was crowned by Pope Clement VII at Bologna it was noted that functions which belonged of right to Princes of the Empire were performed by Spanish Grandees. His promise to the German nation to restore to the Empire its pristine extent and glory was interpreted in practice as an undertaking to enhance at all costs the prestige of the Habsburg family. The loss of its theoretical rights over such States as Milan and Genoa was, however, rather a sentimental than a real grievance to the nation. It had better cause for complaint

when Charles (1543) in effect severed the Netherlands from the Empire and transferred them to Spain. He sacrificed German interests in Holstein to those of his brother-in-law Christian II of Denmark; and, although he was not primarily responsible for the loss of Metz, Toul, and Verdun in 1552, his neglect of German interests along the Slavonic coasts of the Baltic was not without effect upon the eventual incorporation of Esthonia, Livonia, and Courland, in the Russian domains of the Czar. German troops had been wont to march on Rome; but Charles brought Italian troops to the banks of the Elbe. He introduced into Germany that Spanish taint which was only washed out in the Thirty Years' War; and he then sought to turn that tide of northern influence, which has been flowing ever since the decline of the Roman Empire.

In religion as well as in politics Charles' increasingly Spanish tendencies had an evil effect on the Empire. He was no theologian, and he could never comprehend the Reformers' objections to Roman dogma; but that did not make him less hostile to their cause. His attitude towards religion was half way between the genial orthodoxy of his grandfather Maximilian and the gloomy fanaticism of his son Philip II, but his mind was always travelling away from the former and towards the latter position; and the transition enhanced the difficulty of coming to an accommodation with Lutheran heretics.

This orthodoxy, however, implied no blindness to the abuses of the Pope's temporal power, and was always conditioned by regard for the Emperor's material interests. The fervid declaration of zeal against Luther which Charles read at the Diet of Worms has been described as the most genuine expression of his religious feelings. No doubt it was sincere, but it is well to note that the Emperor's main desire was then to wean Leo X from his alliance with Francis I, and to prove to the papal Nuncio that, whatever the Diet might do, Charles' heart was in the right place. If he often assumed the *rôle* of papal champion, he could on occasion remember that he was the successor of Henry IV, and to some at least the Sack of Rome must have seemed a revenge for the scene at Canossa. He could tell Clement that that outrage was the just judgment of God, he could seize the temporalities of the bishopric of Utrecht, and speak disrespectfully of papal excommunications. He could discuss proposals for deposing the Pope and destroying his temporal power, and was even tempted to think that Luther might one day become of importance if Clement continued to thwart the imperial plans.

With Charles, as with every prince of the age, including the Pope, political far outweighed religious motives. Chivalry and the crusading spirit were both dead. His religious faith and family pride might both have impelled him to avenge upon Henry VIII the wrongs of Catharine of Aragon; but these, he said, were private griefs; they must not be allowed to interfere with the public considerations which compelled him

to conciliate the English King; and his one aim throughout the affair was to provide for the succession of his cousin to the throne of England. That was a clear dynastic issue which appealed to Charles with a force which no other motive could rival. One simple principle pervaded the whole of Charles' actions, and one object he pursued with unswerving fidelity throughout his public career. It was neither the conversion of heretics nor the overthrow of the Turks; it was not even a national object, for Charles was too cosmopolitan and his lands too heterogeneous for him to become such an exponent of national aspirations as Francis I and Henry II were in France, or Henry VIII and Elizabeth in England. But he was deeply imbued with pride in the Habsburg race and faith in the family star. To the service of the Habsburgs he devoted his industry, his patience, his tenacity of purpose, and his great diplomatic abilities. Therein lay the reason of his ultimate failure; in the end the principle of nationality defied the Habsburg power, and not a foot of the land conquered by Charles remains to the Spaniard to-day.

The imperial throne of Germany was thus a possession which Charles sought to use in the Habsburg interest; and this idea dominated not merely his foreign policy but the course he pursued with regard to domestic affairs. He was told by his minister, Maximilian von Zevenbergen, that the only means to prevent the Empire from becoming a democratic republic like Switzerland was the extension within its borders of the absolutist Habsburg power, and to this dynastic use the Emperor turned, so far as he could, his prerogative as national sovereign. The great enemy of imperial unity was the territorial principle, and Charles himself regarded it as such, yet he never hesitated to extend his territorial possessions at the expense of the national government. Every element in the German State tended towards separation, but the greatest separatist of all was the Emperor. Besides virtually severing the Netherlands from the Empire, he sought to exempt his hereditary possessions from the jurisdiction of the national Courts of law, from contributing to the national taxes, and from sharing the burden of national government. He was to be as absolute as he could in the Empire at large, but while he controlled the national government, the national government was to have no control over his hereditary lands. It mattered little how much the imperial authority diminished provided the Habsburg power grew; no one should henceforth be Emperor unless he came of the Habsburg race. The extent of his heritage was greater than that of the German *Reich*, and he thought that his allegiance to his family transcended his obligations to any one of the realms over which he ruled. But, so far as Germany was concerned, the Emperor Charles V never rose from a narrow dynastic to a broad national conception of his duties and of his opportunities as ruler of Germany. Both the extent of the realm and the authority of the central government dwindled under his sway; he narrowed the German *Reich* and weakened the *Reichsregiment*.

While German national interests were thus subordinated to those of a family, while the nominal control of the Empire's foreign policy was vested in the hands of one who regarded Germany as only a piece in the game of dynastic ambitions, the German people reaped no corresponding advantage from increased security. The endless roll of principalities and powers which adorned Charles V's style and dazzled the eyes of the Electors proved no more than a paper wall of defence. The Emperor's strength was also his weakness; it was dissipated all over Europe, and though Germans turned the scale in Italy, few troops came from Spain or Burgundy to defend the Empire against the Turks or the French. While Francis I and Solyman wielded swords, Charles V seemed to brandish an armoury of cumbrous weapons, which were only of use if used all together, and were frequently unavailable at the critical moment. Germany had to look to itself for defence, and a further element of separatism was fostered by the consequent tendency of individual Princes to make arrangements with Charles' enemies behind the Emperor's back.

The nation was not long left in doubt as to the character of the ruler whom it had chosen or the objects he meant to pursue. German envoys to Spain were not well pleased with their youthful sovereign's obvious devotion to priestly rites, or with the intimation that they must negotiate in the Flemish tongue because Charles could speak neither German nor Latin. Nor was his first act as Emperor calculated to reassure his people. Amid the confusion of the interregnum Ulrich, the dispossessed Duke of Württemberg, attempted to recover his duchy; he was easily defeated by the Swabian League, which ceded its conquest to Charles on repayment of the cost of the campaign. Ulrich was a ruffian who deserved no consideration, but his vices did not abrogate the rights of his heirs, and it was utterly repugnant to German custom and sentiment for the Emperor to confer a fief upon himself. No territory, however, was so convenient for the extension of Austria's influence as Wurttemberg; with it in Habsburg hands, Zevenbergen thought that Charles and his brother would dominate Germany, and so Wurttemberg passed into Habsburg possession, with Zevenbergen as its governor.

Troubles in Spain and adverse winds delayed Charles' departure from the shores of Galicia until May, 1520, and his two interviews with Henry VIII further postponed his coronation at Aachen until October 23. There he swore to observe the promises made before his election, and on November 1 he summoned a Diet to meet in the following January. He then made his way up the Rhine to Worms, where, on January 28, the day sacred to Charles the Great, he opened perhaps the most famous of all the Diets in German history (1521).

The dramatic episode of Luther's appearance and condemnation by the Edict of Worms has, however, been allowed to obscure the more important business of the Diet and to convey a somewhat misleading

impression. The devils on the roofs of the houses at Worms were really rather friendly to Luther than otherwise, and the renowned Edict itself was not so much an expression of settled national policy as an expedient, recommended by the temporary exigencies of the Emperor's foreign relations, and only extorted from him by Leo's promise to cease from supporting Charles' foes. Probably Charles himself had no expectation of seeing the Edict executed, and certainly the Princes who passed it had no such desire. They were much more intent on securing redress of their grievances against the Church than on chastising the man who had attacked their common enemy; and the fact that the Diet which condemned Luther's heresy also solemnly formulated a comprehensive indictment against the Roman Church throws a vivid light upon the twofold aspect which the Reformation assumed in Germany as elsewhere.

The origin of the whole movement was a natural attempt on the part of man, with the progress of enlightenment, to emancipate himself from the clerical tutelage under which he had laboured for centuries, and to remedy the abuses which were an inevitable outcome of the exclusive privileges and authority of the Church. These abuses were traced directly or indirectly to the exemption of the Church and its possessions from secular control, and to the dominion which it exercised over the laity; and the revolt against this position of immunity and privilege was one of the most permanently and universally successful movements of modern history. It was in the beginning quite independent of dogma, and it has pervaded Catholic as well as Protestant countries. The State all over the world has completely deposed the Church from the position it held in the Middle Ages; and the existence of Churches, whether Catholic or Protestant, in the various political systems, is due not to their own intrinsic authority but to the fact that they are tolerated or encouraged by the State. No ecclesiastic has any appeal from the temporal laws of the land in which he lives. In 1521 clerical ministers ruled the greater part of Europe, Wolsey in England, Adrian in Spain, Du Prat in France, and Matthew Lang to no small extent in Germany; to-day there is not a clerical prime minister in the world, and the temporal States of the Catholic Church have shrunk to the few acres covered by the Vatican. The Church has ceased to trespass on secular territory and returned to her original spiritual domain.

This was, roughly speaking, the main issue of the Reformation; it was practically universal, while the dogmatic questions were subsidiary and took different forms in different localities. It was on this principle that the German nation was almost unanimous in its opposition to Rome, and its feelings were accurately reflected in the Diet at Worms. Even Frederick of Saxony was averse from Luther's repudiation of Catholic doctrine, but, if the Reformer had confined himself to an attack on the Church in its temporal aspect, Pope and Emperor together would

have been powerless to secure his condemnation. The whole nation, wrote a canon of Worms, was of one mind with regard to clerical immorality, from Emperor down through all classes to the last man. Nine-tenths of Germany, declared the papal Nuncio, cried "Long live Luther," and the other tenth shouted "Death to the Church." Duke George of Saxony, the staunchest of Catholics, was calling for a General Council to reform abuses, and Gattinara, Charles' shrewdest adviser, echoed the recommendation. Even Jean Glapion, the Emperor's confessor, was believed to be not averse from an accommodation with Luther, provided that he would disavow the *Babylonish Captivity*, and in Worms itself the papal emissaries went about in fear of assassination. The Germans, wrote Tunstall to Wolsey from Worms, were everywhere so addicted to Luther that a hundred thousand of them would lay down their lives to save him from the penalties pronounced by the Pope.

This popular enthusiasm for Luther led Napoleon to express the belief that, had Charles adopted his cause, he could have conquered Europe at the head of a united Germany. But an imperial sanction of Lutheranism would not have killed the separatist tendencies of German politics, nor was it Lutheran doctrine which had captivated the hearts of the German people. He was the hero of the hour solely because he stood for the national opposition to Rome. The circumstances in Germany in 1521 were not very dissimilar from those in England in 1529. There was an almost universal repugnance to clerical privilege and to the Roman Curia, but the section of the nation which was prepared to repudiate Catholic dogma was still insignificant; and a really national government, which regarded national unity as of more importance than the immediate triumph of any religious party, would have pursued a policy something like that of Henry VIII in his later years. It would have kept the party of doctrinal revolution in due subordination to the national movement against the abuses of a corrupt clerical caste and an Italian domination; it would have endeavoured to satisfy the popular demand for practical reform, without alienating the majority by surrendering to a sectional agitation against Catholic dogma. But both the man and the forces were wanting. Charles often dallied with the idea of a limited practical reform, and he had already slighted the Papacy by allowing Luther to be heard at the Diet of Worms after his condemnation by the Pope, as if an imperial edict were of more effect in matters of faith than a papal Bull. He could hardly, however, be Reformer in Germany and reactionary in Spain, and the necessities of his dynastic position as well as his personal feelings tied him to the Catholic cause. His frequent and prolonged periods of absence and his absorption in other affairs prevented him from bestowing upon the government of Germany that vigilant and concentrated attention which alone enabled Henry VIII to effect his aims in England;

and the task of dealing with the religious, and with the no less troublesome political and social discord in Germany, was left to the Council of Regency and practically, for five years, to Ferdinand.

The composition and powers of this body were among the chief questions which came before the Diet of Worms. When the electors extorted from Charles a promise to re-establish the *Reichsregiment*, they had in their mind a national administration like that suggested by Berthold of Mainz; when Charles gave his pledge, he was thinking of a Council which should be, like Maximilian's, Aulic rather than national; and he imagined that he was redeeming his pledge when he proposed to the Diet the formation of a government which was to have no control over foreign affairs, and a control, limited by his own assent, over domestic administration. The Regent or head of the Council and six of its twenty members were to be nominated by the Emperor; these were to be permanent, but the other fourteen, representing the Empire, were to change every quarter. This body was to have no power over Charles' hereditary dominions, nor over the newly-won Württemberg. The Emperor, in short, was to control the national government, but the writs of the national government were not to run in the Habsburg territories. On the other hand, the Princes demanded a form of government which would have practically eliminated the imperial factor from the Empire; the governing Council was to have the same authority whether Charles himself were present or not, it was to decide foreign as well as domestic questions, and in it the Emperor should be represented only in the same way as other Princes, namely, by a proportionate number of members chosen from his hereditary lands.

In the compromise which followed Charles secured the decisive point. The government which was formed was too weak to weld Germany into a political whole, able to withstand the disintegrating influence of its own particularism and of the Habsburg dynastic interest; and Charles was left free to pursue throughout his reign the old imperial maxim, *divide et impera.* The *Reichsregiment* was to have independent power only during the Emperor's absence; at other times it was to sink into an advisory body, and important decisions must always have his assent. He was to nominate the president and four out of the Council's twenty-two members; but his own dominions were to be subject to its authority, the determination of religious questions was left largely in the hands of the Estates, and Charles undertook to form no leagues or alliances affecting the Empire without the Council's consent. The reconstitution of the supreme national court of justice or *Reichskammergericht* presented few variations from the form adopted at Constance in 1507, and the ordinance establishing it is almost word for word the same as the original proposal of Berthold of Mainz in 1495; the imperial influence was slightly increased by the provision permitting him to nominate two additional assessors to the Court, but, being paid

by the Empire and not by the Emperor, its members retained their independence.

A measure which ultimately proved to be of more importance than the reorganisation of these two institutions was the partition of the Habsburg inheritance. One of the most cherished projects of Ferdinand of Aragon had been the creation in northern Italy of a kingdom for the benefit of the younger of his two grandsons, which would have left Charles free to retain his Austrian lands. That scheme had failed; but the younger Ferdinand, especially when he became betrothed to the heiress of Hungary and Bohemia, could not decently remain unendowed while his brother possessed so much, and on April 28, 1521, a contract was ratified transferring to Ferdinand the five Austrian duchies, of Austria, Carinthia, Carniola, Styria, and Tyrol. This grant formed the nucleus of the present so-called Dual Monarchy; it was gradually extended by the transference to Ferdinand of all Charles V's possessions and claims in Germany, and the success with which the younger brother governed his German subjects made them regret that Ferdinand had not been elected Emperor in 1519 instead of having to wait thirty-seven years for the prize.

Soon after the conclusion of the Diet of Worms Charles left Germany, which he was not to see again until nine years later; and long before then the attempt of the central government to control the disruptive forces of political and religious separatism had hopelessly broken down. A pathetic interest attaches to the intervening struggles of the *Reichsregiment* as being the last efforts to create a modern German national State co-extensive with the medieval Empire, a State which would have included not only the present German Empire, but Austria and the Netherlands, and which, stretching from the shores of the Baltic to those of the Adriatic sea, and from the Straits of Dover to the Niemen or the Vistula, would have dominated modern Europe; and a good deal of angry criticism has been directed against the particularist bodies which one after another repudiated the authority of the government and brought its work to nought. But particularism had so completely permeated Germany that the very efforts at unity were themselves tainted with particularist motives; and one reason alike for the favour with which Princes like Frederick of Saxony regarded the *Reichsregiment*, and for its ultimate failure, was that, with its ostensible unifying purpose, the government combined aims which served the interests of Princes against those of other classes.

The great Princes of the Empire present a double aspect, varying with the point of view from which they are regarded. To Charles they were collectively an oligarchy which threatened to destroy the monarchical principle embodied in the person of the Emperor; but individually and from the point of view of their own dominions they represented a monarchical principle similar to that which gave unity and strength to

France, to England, and to Spain, a territorial principle more youthful and more vigorous than the effete *Kaisertum.* The force of political gravitation had already modified profoundly the internal constitution of the Empire; States like Saxony, Brandenburg, and Bavaria had acquired consistency and weight, and began to exercise an attraction over the numberless molecules of the Empire which the more distant and nebulous luminary of the *Kaisertum* could not counteract. The petty knight, the cities and towns, found it ever more difficult to resist the encroachments of neighbouring Princes; and princely influence over municipal elections and control over municipal finance went on increasing throughout the sixteenth century, till towards its end the former autonomy of all but a select number of cities had well-nigh disappeared. It was not from the Emperor but from the Princes that knights and burgesses feared attacks on their liberties, and their danger threw them into an attitude of hostility to the *Reichsregiment*, a body by means of which the Princes sought to exercise in their own interests the national power. They could also appeal to the higher motive of imperial unity; the strength of individual Princes meant the weakness of the Emperor, and unity in parts might seem to be fatal to the unity of the whole.

The Diet of Worms had in fact been a struggle between Emperor and Princes, in which neither had paid much regard to inferior classes, and the spoils were divided exclusively between the two combatants. The knightly order was denied all share in the government of the Empire; they could expect no more consideration than before in their endless disputes over territory with their more powerful neighbours, and the *Reichskammergericht* with its Roman law they regarded as an insufferable infringement of their own feudal franchises. The cities were not less discontented. They had been refused any representation in the *Reichsregiment*, subsidies had been voted without their concurrence, and they anticipated with reason fresh taxation which would fall mainly on their shoulders.

The new government was established at Nürnberg in November, 1521, and in the following February it met the Diet. The first business was to raise forces to serve against the Turks before whose advance Belgrade had just fallen; and with Charles' consent a portion of the supplies voted for the Emperor's abandoned journey to Rome was applied to this purpose. Greater difficulty was experienced in finding means to defray the expenses of the imperial council and court of justice. It was proposed to revert to the Common Penny, to tax the Jews, and to apply the annates of the German Church, which supported the Roman Curia, to the purposes of the national government. But all these suggestions were rejected in favour of a scheme which offered the threefold advantage of promoting German unity, of relieving German capitalists of some of their superfluous wealth, and of sparing the

pockets of those who voted the tax. All classes had soon perceived that there could be no peace and no justice unless somebody paid for its maintenance and administration, and with one voice they began to excuse themselves from the honour of providing the funds. It was necessary, however, to select a victim, and the choice of the mercantile interest was received with acclamation by every other class in Germany.

The commercial revolution which marked the end of the fifteenth and beginning of the sixteenth century had led, as such revolutions always do, to the rapid and disproportionate accumulation of wealth in the hands of the few who knew how to exploit it; and the consequent growth of luxury and increase of the power of mercantile magnates were a constant theme of denunciation in the mouths of less fortunate men. The canonist doctrine of usury, based on the Scriptural prohibition, still held sway in all but commercial circles, and the forestalling and regrating, against which the English statute-book is so eloquent, excited no less odium in Germany. Theologians united with lawyers in denouncing the *Fuggerei* of the great trading companies; Luther and Zwingli, Hutten and Erasmus were of one mind on the question. Erasmus described the merchants as the basest of all mankind, and it was partly due to this feeling that the lawless robbery of traders at the hands of roving knights went on openly without an attempt to check it; the humanist, Heinrich Bebel, even declared that the victims owed their captors a debt of gratitude because the seizure of their ill-gotten goods smoothed their path to heaven.

This moral antipathy to the evil effects of wealth, as exhibited in other people, was reinforced by the prevalent idea that money and riches were synonymous terms, and that the German nation was being steadily impoverished by the export of precious metals to pay for the imports it received from other countries, and especially English cloth and Portuguese spices. It was felt that some check must be put upon the process, and a national tax on imports and exports would, it was thought, cure this evil, satisfy at once the moral indignation of people and Princes against capitalists and their selfish desire for fiscal immunity, and provide a stable financial basis for the national executive and judicial system, for the defence of the realm against foreign foes, and for the maintenance of peace within its borders. The measure as passed by the Diet of Nurnberg in 1522 exempted all the necessaries of life, but imposed a duty of four per cent. on all other merchandise, to be paid on exports as well as on imports. Custom-houses were to be erected along the whole frontier of the Empire, which was defined for the purpose. Switzerland refused its consent and was excluded, and so were Bohemia and Prussia, the latter as being a fief of Poland, but the Netherlands were reckoned as an integral part of the Empire; and, had the project been carried out, it would have provided not only the revenues which were its immediate object, but an invaluable lever for the unification of Germany.

Not content, however, with this victory over the moneyed classes obtained through the co-operation of their own particular interests with a national sentiment, nor with the further prohibition of all trading companies possessing a capital of more than fifty thousand crowns, the Princes proceeded at the Diet held at Nürnberg in November, 1522, to strike at the imperial cities which had hitherto refrained from making common cause with the capitalists. In language which reminds English readers of James I, they affirmed that the participation of the cities in the affairs of the Empire was not a matter of right, but of grace and a privilege which might be withdrawn at pleasure; when the Electors and Princes had agreed on a measure, the cities, they said, had nothing to do but consent, and they were now required to levy a contribution towards the Turkish war which had been voted without their concurrence.

The golden age of the towns had passed away in Germany as well as in Italy, their brilliant part in history had been played out, and they were already yielding place to greater political organisations; but they were not yet prepared to surrender to the Princes without a struggle. At a congress of cities held at Speier in March, 1523, it was resolved to appeal from the *Reichsregiment* to the Emperor, and an embassy was sent to lay their case before Charles at Valladolid in August. At first the imperial Court took up an attitude of real or feigned hostility to their demands, and there seems to be no conclusive evidence that this revolt against the national government had been encouraged by Charles. Yet the particularist interest of the cities appealed to the particularist interest of the Emperor with a force which he could not resist. The opposition had been engineered by the Fuggers; and Charles' chronic insolvency rendered him peculiarly susceptible to the arguments which they could best apply; Jacob Fugger had even boasted that to him and his house Charles owed his election as Emperor. So now the deputies undertook that Charles should not lose financially by granting their request, and they also promised his councillors a grateful return for their trouble. Other grounds were alleged; it was hinted that the Princes would use the proceeds of the tax in a way that boded no good to the imperial power in Germany; there was a scheme in hand for the appointment of a King of the Romans who with adequate financial support might reduce the Emperor to a cipher; moreover the *Reichsregiment* which required this revenue was itself superfluous; if Charles would select a trustworthy Regent and maintain the *Kammergericht*, that would meet all the exigencies of the case, and his own position in the Empire would be materially strengthened. Finally, to remove Charles' suspicions of the cities based on their alleged countenance of Lutheranism, they made the somewhat confident assertion that not a syllable of Luther's works had been printed in their jurisdiction for years, and that it was not with them that Luther and his followers found protection.

Satisfied with these assurances Charles intimated that he would take the government into his own hands, appoint a Regent and a fresh *Kammergericht*, forbid the imposition of the obnoxious tax, and prohibit the *Regiment* from dealing with monopolies without again asking his consent. The first great blow at the national government had been struck by the Emperor at the instigation of the German cities; another was at the moment being struck by the German nobility and a section of the German Princes

Of all the disorderly elements in the German Empire the most dangerous was the *Ritterschaft*, a class whose characteristics are not adequately denoted by the nearest English equivalent, "knights." Their bearing towards the government and towards the other Estates of the realm recalls that of the English baronage under Stephen and Henry II, and another parallel to their position may be found in the Polish nobles or "gentlemen" whose success in reducing the other elective monarchy in Europe to anarchy would probably have been repeated by the German *Ritterschaft* but for the restraining force of the territorial Princes. Like the English barons and the Polish nobles they recognised no superior but their monarch, enjoyed no occupation so much as private war, and resisted every attempt to establish orderly government. They had special grievances in the early part of the sixteenth century; the development of commerce was accompanied by a corresponding agricultural depression; and while wealth in the towns increased and prices rose, the return from rents and services remained stationary unless they were exploited on commercial principles. In France and in England under strong monarchies the lords of the land saved their financial position by sheep-farming, enclosures, and other businesslike pursuits, but in Germany pride, or inadaptability, or special facilities for private war kept the knights from resorting to such expedients, and their main support was wholesale brigandage. They took to robbery as to a trade and considered it rather an honour to be likened to wolves. Like wolves, however, they were generally hungry; the organisation of territorial States and the better preservation of peace had, moreover, rendered their trade at once more dangerous and unprofitable; and in 1522 there were knights who lived in peasants' cottages, and possessed incomes of no more than fourteen crowns a year.

To their poverty fresh burdens were added by the reforms of the national government; the prohibition of private war, the supersession of their ancient feudal customs by the newly-received Roman law, the constant pressure of their powerful neighbours the Princes, drove them into a position of chronic discontent; and in the summer of 1522 the knights of the middle and upper Rhine provinces assembled at Landau and resolved to repudiate the authority of the *Reichskammergericht* on the ground that it was dominated by the influence of their natural foes, the Princes. They found a leader in the notorious Franz von Sickingen,

who has been regarded both as the champion of the poorer classes and as a Gospel pioneer. Probably his motives were mainly personal and he adopted the cause of his fellow-knights only because that *rôle* suited his private purposes. Charles V had taken him into his service and employed him in the war with France, but Sickingen's success and rewards had not been commensurate with his hopes, and he sought other means to satisfy the extravagant ambition of becoming Elector of Trier or even a King.

A decent cloak for his private ends and for the class interests of the knights was found in the religious situation. Sickingen was apparently a genuine Lutheran; Bucer lived in his castle, the Ebernburg, Oecolampadius preached to his followers, and four hundred knights had undertaken Luther's defence at the Diet of Worms. The Reformer was grateful and addressed Sickingen as his especial lord and patron. He looked to the *Ritter* as a sword of the Gospel, and openly incited them to rise and spoil the unregenerate priests and prelates; while Hutten, whose sympathies were naturally on the knightly side, urged Sickingen to emulate Ziska, and endeavoured to enlist the towns in the service of the opposition to their common foe, the territorial Princes. Some of these Princes were, however, already half Lutherans; the Elector of Saxony was Luther's great patron, the Elector Palatine was full of doubts, and in any case was no friend to the Bishops, and prudence forbade open war in the ranks of the Reformers. An ingenious method of avoiding it, and of combining secular and religious interests under Sickingen's banner, was found in the proposal to limit the attack to the ecclesiastical Princes whose worldly goods were an offence to Lutheran divines, whose jurisdiction was a perpetual grievance to the cities, and whose territorial powers infringed knightly liberties.

And so, when in August, 1522, Sickingen revived his feud with the Archbishop-Elector of Trier and entered his territory at the head of an army which he had levied nominally for the Emperor's service, he had some hopes of success. The government put him under the ban of the Empire, but Sickingen laughed at threats and proceeded to carry on the controversy with fire and sword. Unfortunately these arguments were double-edged, and Trier to which he laid siege offered an unexpected resistance. The Archbishop himself evinced a martial valour at least equal to his spiritual zeal, and the knightly emissaries met with no response to their appeals from the people of the city; the traders had suffered too much from the wolves outside to wish to see them, even though they came in sheep's clothing, encamped within their walls. The allies whom Sickingen expected from Franconia were intercepted, and on September 14 he was forced to raise the siege and to retreat to his stronghold at Landstuhl. Here he thought himself secure against any attack; but his elaborate fortifications were not proof against the new and powerful artillery which the Princes brought into the field. In

April, 1523, his walls crumbled before it, he was himself mortally wounded by a splinter of stone, and died soon after his surrender. He was the last of the German *Ritter*, and the cannon which battered his castle were symbolical of the forces which proved fatal to the independence of his class.

This victory over one of the most formidable disruptive forces in the Empire might have been expected to strengthen the national government, but it was won in spite of, and not by, the *Reichsregiment*. That body had been unable to keep the peace even in the immediate vicinity of Nurnberg where it sat, and whither its members came in disguise to avoid molestation at the hands of knightly robbers. Still less could it cope with a force like that at Sickingen's disposal, and the rebellion had been put down by three Princes, the Elector Palatine, the Archbishop of Trier, and the young Landgrave, Philip of Hesse, who had acted on their own responsibility and in conjunction with the Swabian League, an organisation embodying within itself prelates, Princes, lesser nobility, and towns, but working in its external relations for the furtherance of the particularist interests of the House of Austria. This alliance had early in the course of the revolt taken matters into its own hands and treated the government with as much contempt as Sickingen had done himself. As a natural result the *Reichsregiment* began to incline to the knightly side, and Frederick of Saxony came to an agreement with the rebels. Neither event had any effect upon the result of the struggle. After the fall of Landstuhl the three Princes and the Swabian League proceeded to crush the Franconian knights. This was done with little difficulty, their power was broken for ever, and Ulrich von Hutten fled to Switzerland, where he died soon afterwards in the midst of a controversy with his former friend Erasmus. The victors then punished the offenders and divided their spoils without the least reference to the wishes or commands of the government; and the main result of the episode was to exhibit in startling contrast the impotence of the *Reichsregiment* and the vigour of the territorial power of individual Princes.

The *Regiment* was visibly tottering to its fall, and in January, 1524, it met the Diet for the last time at Nurnberg. Frederick of Saxony came prepared with a sheaf of reforms, but it was a question of ending and not of mending, and with that determination in their minds the various sections of the opposition gathered in force. The deputies of the towns had returned from Spain bringing the Emperor's veto on the one practicable means of financing the administration. Charles' chancellor, Franz Hannart, followed to fan the discontent. The wealth of Germany was ranged against the government which had endeavoured to abolish monopolies, to tax trade, and to restrict the operations of capital. Duke George of Saxony had already declined to support an authority which had shown itself so powerless to enforce respect for its

decrees, and the three Princes of the Palatinate, of Trier, and of Hesse had withdrawn their representatives from the *Reichsregiment*. The Swabian League was encouraged to resist encroachments on its autonomy, and the two main supports of the administration, the Electors of Mainz and Saxony, were engaged in personal quarrels. When the Diet opened, one after another of the representatives of the vested interests rose to denounce the government, and a practical vote of censure was carried by the refusal of the Diet to consider any scheme for raising revenue until the administration was changed.

So ended the last attempt to create a national government for the medieval German Empire. The *Reichsregiment* was indeed continued, but it was removed to Esslingen, where it sat under the shadow of Austrian domination, and was shorn of the little independent authority it had wielded before. Germany was submerged under a flood of constitutional chaos and personal rivalry. Ferdinand was plotting against the Elector of Saxony; many Princes were alienated from Charles by his failure to pay their pensions; and Francis I was seeking to fish in the troubled waters. The experiment of the *Reichsregiment* had, in fact, been foredoomed to failure from the first; the government contained within itself the seeds of its own disruption because its aims had not been single or disinterested. It was an attempt at national unity dominated by particularist interests. The opposition of the towns and of the knights had not been evoked because the government sought national unity but because it administered the national authority in the interests of territorial Princes; the single city of Nürnberg had for instance been taxed higher than any one of the Electors. Nor would national unity have been secured if the oligarchy of Princes had perpetuated its control of the government, for the individual members would soon have quarrelled among themselves. Their dissensions were, indeed, patent even when their collective authority was threatened by common enemies. Each, wrote Hannart to his master, wanted to have the affairs of the Empire regulated according to his individual taste; they all demanded a national government and a national system of judicature, but no one would tolerate the interference of these institutions in his own household and jurisdiction; everyone in short wished to be master himself.

In such circumstances Charles was perhaps justified in preferring, like the rest, the extension of his own territorial power to every other object. He may have perceived the impossibility of founding national unity on a discredited imperial system. Unity did not come through any of the methods suggested by the reforming Diets; it only came when the imperial decay, which they tried to check, had run its full course and the Emperor's supremacy had succumbed to the principle of territorial monarchy. To the extension of that principle by methods of blood and iron Germany owes her modern unity as England, France,

and Spain owed their unity in the sixteenth century. It was the most potent political principle then fermenting in Europe; destroying the old, it led to the construction of the new.

The failure of the attempt at political reform involved the ruin of all hopes of a religious settlement which should be either peaceful or national, for the only instrument by which such an object could have been achieved was broken in pieces. Each political organism within the Empire was left to work out its own salvation at its own option without the stimulus or control of a central government; and the contrast between the course of the Reformation in Germany and its development in England affords some facilities for comparing the relative advantages and disadvantages of a strong national monarchy. In Germany at all events there can be no pretence that the whole movement was due to the arbitrary caprice of an absolute King. To whatever extent it may have had its roots in the baser passions of mankind, it was at least a popular manifestation. It came from below, and not from above. Charles V was hostile from conviction and from the exigencies of his personal position; the ecclesiastical Princes were hostile from interest if not from conviction; of the temporal Princes only one could be described as friendly, and even Frederick of Saxony was not yet a Lutheran. He was still treasuring a collection of relics and he had spoken severely of Luther's *Babylonish Captivity*. His attitude towards all religious movements, however extravagant, was rather that of Gamaliel, on whose advice to the Sanhedrim he seems to have modelled his action; if they were of men they would come to nought of themselves, and rather than be found fighting against God he would take his staff in his hand and quit his dominions for ever.

But whatever animosity the authorities may have entertained against the movement was neutralised by their impotence. The Edict of Worms left nothing to be desired in the comprehensiveness of its condemnations or in the severity of its penalties, and the Roman hierarchy was particularly gratified by the subjection of the press to rigid censorship and by the relegation of its exercise to the Church. But, while the Edict had been sanctioned by the national Diet, its execution depended entirely upon local authorities who were reluctant to enforce it in face of the almost universal disapproval. The Primate himself, the Archbishop of Mainz, for fear of riots refused his clergy licence even to preach against the outlawed monk; and at Constance, for instance, not only was the publication of the Edict refused, but the imperial commissioners who came to secure its execution were driven out of the city with threats. Both the Edict of Charles and the Bull of Leo remained dead letters in Germany outside the private domains of the House of Habsburg; and the chief effect of the campaign of the allied Pope, Emperor, and King

of England against Luther was a bonfire of the heretic's works in London and another at Ghent.

The censorship of the press was never more ludicrously ineffective to stop a revolution. In spite of it the number of books issued from German printing-presses in 1523 was more than twelve times as great as the number issued ten years before, and of these four-fifths were devoted to the cause of the Reformation. It was only with great difficulty that printers could be induced to publish works in defence of the Catholic Church, and they had often to be repaid for the loss in which the limited circulation of such books involved them. On the other hand Luther's own writings, violent satires like the *Karsthans* and *Neukarsthans*, and Hans Sachs' *Wittenbergische Nachtigall*, enjoyed an immense popularity. The effervescence of the national mind evoked a literature vigorous but rude in form and coarse in expression, the common burden of which was invective against the Church, and especially the monastic orders; and this indigenous literature stirred to passion the mass of the lower middle classes which the alien and esoteric ideals of the Humanists had failed to touch. The pencil was scarcely less effective than the pen; Albrecht Durer and Lucas Cranach were almost as zealous champions of the new ideas as Luther and Hutten, and probably few pictures have had a greater popular influence than Durer's portrayal of St John taking precedence of St Peter, and of St Paul as the protector of the Gospel. An English nobleman travelling in Germany in 1523 was amazed by the number of "abominable pictures" ridiculing the friars, though he sent to his King some similar specimens satirising Murner, on whom Henry had bestowed a hundred pounds for his attack on Luther and for his translation of Henry's own book.

The motive of all this literature was as yet practical rather than doctrinal, to eradicate the abuses of the ecclesiastical organisation rather than to establish any fresh dogmatic system; and the revolutionary tendencies were strongest in the middle classes, which dominated the town life in Germany. Though supported by the knights the Reformation was in the main a *bourgeois* movement; it was the religious aspect of the advent of the middle classes. They had already emancipated themselves from the medieval feudal system, and they had long been fretting against the trammels which the Church imposed upon their individual and corporate autonomy. Clerical immunities from municipal taxation, episcopal jurisdiction over otherwise free towns produced a never-ceasing source of irritation. To these commercial classes Eberlin of Gunzburg's assertions that the papal Curia cost Germany three hundred thousand crowns a year, and that the friars extracted another million, were irresistible arguments for the elimination of papal control over the German Church and for the dissolution of the friars' Orders. This predisposition to attack the Church was reinforced by the lingering

remnants of the Hussite movement. Some members of that sect ha settled on the borders of Silesia and Moravia in the middle of tl fifteenth century; and they are claimed as the founders of the lat Bohemian Brethren. Wimpheling and Pirkheimer had remarked tl recrudescence of the Hussite heresy; and Wolfgang Capito declares th in his youth he had often heard his elders read the writings of tl Bohemian Reformers. Luther's words were not entirely novel accent but the echoes of half-forgotten sounds repeated with a novel force.

So while the Princes held aloof from the movement it progresse with rapid strides in the cities. At Nürnberg under the eyes of th national government the churches of St Lawrence and St Sebal resounded with the new doctrines, and Osiander under the protectio of the city authorities began to proselytise not only among the citizer but among the numbers of public officials, from clerks to Prince who were brought to Nürnberg by the business of the Empire. Th Austrian administration of Wurttemberg closed its churches to th Reformers, but almost all the small imperial cities of Swabia favoure the Reformation. Eberlin of Günzburg was the most popular of th Swabian preachers, but Hall, Nordlingen, Reutlingen, Esslingen, an Heilbronn listened to the precepts of Brenz, Billicanus, Alber, Styfe and Lachmann. Strassburg and the southern cities of the Swabia circle were powerfully influenced by the example of their Swiss neigh bours; and in 1524, the year in which Zwingli established control ove Zurich, Bucer and Capito effected a similar change in Strassburg, whic had already shown its sympathies by committing Murner's works to th flames, by protecting Matthew Zell from the Bishop, and by exercisin the censorship over the press in a way that inflicted no hardship on th Reformers. Elsewhere in Upper Swabia Zwingli's influence was strong his friend Schappeler, who was to play an important part in th Peasants' Revolt, preached at Memmingen, and Hummelberg in Ravens burg, while the disposition of Constance had been proved in 1521 by it refusal to publish the Edict of Worms. In Bavaria and Austria th Reformers were naturally less successful, and one was martyred a Rattenberg. But Jacob Strauss and Urbanus Rhegius preached in th valley of the Inn, Speratus at Salzburg and Vienna, and traces of th Reformed doctrines were found as far south as Tyrol.

In the north the Reformers were not less active. Heinrich Mölle of Zutphen, an Augustinian from the Netherlands, prevailed in Bremer against its Archbishop. Hamburg and Lubeck, Stralsund and Greifs wald, other cities of the Hanseatic League, followed its example Bugenhagen, the historian of Pomerania, was also its evangelist. Königs berg became Lutheran under the auspices of Bishop Polenz of Samland and beyond the limits of the Empire the new doctrines spread to the German colonies at Danzig and Dorpat, Riga and Reval. Herman Tast laboured in Schleswig, Jurien van der Dare (Georgius Aportanus

in east Friesland; and smaller towns in Mecklenburg, Oldenburg, Lüneburg felt the impulse. Magdeburg and Breslau were in close communication with Wittenberg, and at Breslau the object at which the reforming cities were aiming was first achieved when the City Council claimed control over religious instruction on the ground that it built and maintained ecclesiastical edifices. In many cities the result of the struggle between the old faith and the new was indecisive; at Ulm, for instance, the Council determined to maintain a religious neutrality; elsewhere the Catholic clergy retained control of the churches, while Lutheran divines preached to large audiences in the open air.

At first sight it may seem strange that an anti-ecclesiastical movement should have been led by ecclesiastics, but the greatest enemies of a class or order generally come from within it; the most successful leaders of democratic revolutions have usually been aristocrats, and the overthrow of Churches has often been the work of Churchmen. So prominent were members of Luther's own Order in the agitation against religious Orders that the whole thing was thought at first to be only a squabble between Augustinians and Dominicans, like many another which had already broken out and been suppressed. The movement had been hatched in an Augustinian monastery at Wittenberg, and the first to imitate the Wittenberg monks were their Augustinian brethren at Erfurt. In 1522 a Chapter of the Order declared monastic vows to be no longer binding, and a few months later its vicar abandoned his dignity and took a wife. The Augustinians of Eisleben, Magdeburg, Gotha, and Nurnberg soon followed the example of those of Wittenberg and Erfurt, and left their cloisters to become evangelical preachers or to adopt some secular trade. Two members of the Order were the pioneers of Lutheranism in the Netherlands, and two others were there its protomartyrs.

The German Augustinians in fact adopted Luther's cause as a body; no other Order followed their example, but that of St Francis produced at least as many leaders of Reform. From Franciscan cloisters came Myconius, the Reformer of Weimar, who in after years travelled to England in the vain hope of strengthening the Anglican Church in the Lutheran faith; John Eberlin of Günzburg, and Henry of Kettenbach, who worked together at Ulm; Stephen Kempen, the evangelist of Hamburg; John Breismann, the reformer of Kottbus; Gabriel Zwilling, the agitator of Wittenberg; and Conrad Pellican, who translated the Talmud into Latin and impressed with his learning the English Reformers, Whitgift and Jewel, Bradford and Latimer. From among the Dominicans there arose Martin Bucer, a notable name in the history of the German, the Swiss, and the English Reformations; the Brigettines produced Oecolampadius, whose name, like Bucer's, was familiar on both sides of the English Channel. Otto Brunfels was a Carthusian, and Ambrose Blarer a Benedictine. The Carmelite house at Augsburg

was a Lutheran seminary, and Bugenhagen, the Apostle of northern Germany, had been Rector of the Premonstratensian school at Treptow.

From the ranks of the secular priesthood there came few Reformers of eminence, a circumstance which shows that even in their worst days the monastic Orders attracted most of the promising youth. George von Polenz was the only Bishop who openly espoused the Lutheran cause in its early years, though the Bishops of Basel and Breslau, Bamberg and Merseburg were more or less friendly. The halting attitude of the Archbishop of Mainz was due partly to fear and partly to the design he cherished of following the example of Albrecht of Brandenburg and converting his clerical principality into a secular fief.

But the movement, although led by Churchmen, was not the work of the Church or of any other organisation. It was a well-nigh universal spontaneous ebullition of lay and clerical discontent with the social, political, and moral condition of the established Catholic Church. There was no one to organise and guide this volume of passion, for Luther, although the mightiest voice that ever spoke the German language, was *vox et praeterea nihil.* He had none of the practical genius which characterised Calvin or Loyola; and the lack of statesmanlike direction caused the Reforming impulse to break in vain against many of the Catholic strongholds in Germany. Where it succeeded, it owed its success mainly to the fact that its control fell into the hands of a middle-class laity which had already learnt to administer such comprehensive affairs as those of the Hanseatic League. This participation of the laity made the towns the bulwark of the German Reformed faith, and the value of their co-operation was theologically expressed by the enunciation of the doctrine of the universal priesthood of man against the exclusive claims of the Church. Indeed not only were all men priests, but women as well—so declared Matthew Zell, in grateful recognition of the effective aid which women occasionally rendered to the cause of Reform.

That cause had until 1522 been identified with the attempt to remedy those national grievances against worldly priests, high-handed prelates, and a corrupt Italian Papacy, which had been variously expressed in the list of *gravamina* drawn up by the Diet of Worms and in the furious diatribes of popular literature. But gradually and almost imperceptibly this campaign assumed a theological aspect; Luther and his colleagues began to seek a speculative basis for their practical propaganda, and to trace the evil customs of the time to a polluted doctrinal source. Religion in that theological age consisted largely in belief and very slightly in conduct, and the conversion of a movement for practical reform into a war of creeds was inevitable. But it hindered the practical Reformation and helped to destroy the national unity of Germany. There was scarcely a conservative who did not see and admit the need for a purification of the Church; Murner and Eck and, most notably, Erasmus felt it as much as Luther, Melanchthon, and Hutten;

and Duke George of Saxony and Charles V as much as the Elector Frederick. But there was a vast difference between such a recognition and the acknowledgement of Luther's doctrine of the unfree will, between the admission that the theory of good works had been grossly abused and the assertion that all good works were vain. The division thus initiated was deep and permanent, and whereas the practical aims of the Reformation have commanded a universal assent in theory and an ever-widening assent in practice, Luther's theology commanded only a sectional allegiance even among Reformers of his century and a decreasing allegiance in subsequent generations.

But Luther in spite of his repudiation of scholastic theology never got rid of the results of his scholastic training; he must have a complete and logical theory of the universe, and he sought it in the works of the great Father of the Church on whose precepts Luther's own Order had been professedly founded. St Augustine's views on the impotence of the human will had been adopted by the Church in preference to those of his antagonist Pelagius; but in practice their rigour had been mitigated by a host of beneficent dispensations invented to shield mankind from the inevitable effects of its helplessness in the face of original sin. These medieval accretions Luther swept away; he accepted with all its appalling consequences the doctrine of predestination and of the thraldom of mankind to sin, and did not hesitate to make God directly responsible for the evil as well as the good existing in the world. It is a singular phenomenon that a fervent belief in the impotence of the human will should have stimulated one of the most masterful wills which ever affected the destinies of mankind.

The evolution of this doctrine had been but one of the mental activities which occupied Luther during his enforced seclusion at the castle of Wartburg. His abduction had been preconcerted between himself and his friends at the Elector Frederick's Court on the eve of his departure from Worms; and the secret was so well kept that his followers commonly thought that he had been murdered by papal emissaries. Here in his solitude he was subjected to a repetition of those assaults of the devil which he had experienced in the Augustinian cloister. What assurance had he that he was right and the rest of the Church was wrong? But the faith that was in him saved him from his doubts of himself, and hard work prevented him from becoming a visionary. The news that Archbishop Albrecht of Mainz was intent on a fresh recourse to Indulgences provoked a remarkable illustration of Luther's influence; in spite of the efforts of well-wishers at the Saxon Court to keep him quiet, he presented an ultimatum to the Archbishop granting a respite of fourteen days within which Albrecht might retract and escape the perils of the Reformer's fulminations. The Primate of Germany replied with an abject submission.

It was difficult to silence a man who wielded such an authority,

and commentaries on the Psalms and the *Magnificat*, sermons on the Gospels and Epistles for the year, a book on Confession, and an elaborate treatise condemning the validity of monastic vows, flowed with amazing rapidity from his pen. More important was his translation of the New Testament, on which he was engaged during the greater part of his captivity. The old error that versions of the Scriptures in the vernacular tongues were almost unknown before the Reformation has been often exposed, but it is not so often pointed out that these earlier translations were based on the Vulgate and thus reflected the misconceptions of the Church against which the Reformers protested. It was almost as important that translations into the vernacular should be based on original texts as that there should be translations at all, and from a critical point of view the chief merit of Luther's version is that he sought to embody in it the best results of Greek and Hebrew scholarship. But its success was due not so much to the soundness of its scholarship as to the literary form of the translation, and Luther's Bible is as much a classic as the English Authorised Version. If he did not create the *Neuhochdeutsch* which Grimm calls the "Protestant dialect," he first gave it extensive popular currency, and the language of his version, which was based on the Saxon *Kanzleisprache*, superseded alike the old *Hochdeutsch* and *Plattdeutsch*, which were then the prevalent German dialects. The first edition of the New Testament was issued in September, 1522, and a second two months later; the whole Bible was completed in 1534, and in spite of the facts that a Basel printer translated Luther's "outlandish words" into South German and that a *Plattdeutsch* version was also published, the victory of Luther's dialect was soon assured

Luther's Bible became the most effective weapon in the armoury of the German Reformers, and to the infallibility of the Church they and later Protestants opposed the infallibility of Holy Scripture. But this was a claim which Luther himself never asserted for the Bible, and still less for his own translation. His often-quoted remark that the Epistle of St James was an "epistle of straw," should not be separated from Luther's own qualification that it was such only in comparison with the Gospel of St John, the Pauline Epistles, and some other books of the New Testament. But his references to that Epistle and to the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Book of Revelation show a very independent attitude towards the Scriptures. Wherever the words of the Canonical Books seemed to conflict with those of Christ, he preferred the latter as an authority, and further difficulties he left to individual interpretation. Let each man, he writes, hold to what his spirit yields him; and he confessed that he could not reconcile himself to the Book of Revelation. He was in fact supremely eclectic in respect to the Scriptures and to the doctrines he deduced from them; he gave the greatest weight to those Books and to those passages which appealed

most strongly to his own individuality, while he neglected those which, like St James' Epistle, did not suit his doctrines. But he could hardly refuse a like liberty to others, and was thus soon involved in a struggle with Reformers who like himself started from the denial of the authority of the Roman Church, but pressed further than he did his own arguments on the freedom of the will and the weight attaching to Scripture.

Luther's seclusion at the Wartburg did not allay the intellectual ferment at Wittenberg or impair the influence it exercised over the rest of Germany. At Wittenberg both the University and the town defied alike the papal Bull and the imperial Edict. Scholars flocked to the University from all quarters, and it became the metropolis of the reforming movement. Melanchthon forsook the *Clouds* of Aristophanes to devote himself to the Epistles of St Paul; and his *Loci Communes* formed one of the most effective of Lutheran handbooks. But he lacked the force and decision of character to lead or control the revolutionary tendencies which were gathering strength, and Luther's place was taken by his old ally Carlstadt. Carlstadt's was one of those acute intellects which earn for their possessors the reputation of being reckless agitators because they are too far in advance of their age; and the doubts which he entertained of the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch and of the identity of the Gospels, as they then existed, with their original form, were considered to be evidence of the instability of his character rather than of the soundness of his reasoning faculties. He was not, however, free from personal vanity or jealousy of Luther, and his rival's absence afforded him the opportunity of appearing as the leader of the movement. Declining an invitation from Christian II to Denmark, he united with Gabriel Zwilling in an attempt to destroy what Luther had left of the papal system. He attacked clerical celibacy in a voluminous treatise, demanding that marriage should be made compulsory for secular priests and optional for monastics. He denounced the whole institution of monachism, and pronounced the adoration of the Eucharist and private masses to be sinful. On December 3, 1521, there was a riot against the Mass, and the University demanded its abolition throughout the country. The Town Council refused its concurrence in this request, but on Christmas-Day Carlstadt administered the Sacrament of the Altar in both elements, omitting the preparatory confession, the elevation of the Host, and the "abominable canon," which implied that the celebration was a sacrifice. Zwilling next inveighed against the *viaticum* and extreme unction as being a financial trick on the part of the priests, and entered upon an iconoclastic campaign, inviting his hearers to burn the pictures in churches and to destroy the altars.

Reminiscences of Hussite doctrine may have predisposed the Saxon population living on the borders of Bohemia in favour of Carlstadt's proceedings, and he was now reinforced by the influx from Zwickau of

Nicolaus Storch, Thomas Münzer, Marcus Stübner, and their followers, whose views were of a distinctively Hussite, or rather Taborite, tendency. These prophets believed themselves to be under the direct influence of the Holy Spirit, and their immediate intercourse with the source of all truth rendered them independent of any other guidance, even that of the Scriptures. The free interpretation of the Bible which seemed a priceless boon to Luther, was a poor thing to men who believed themselves to be at least as much inspired as its writers. From their repudiation of infant baptism, on the grounds that a sacrament was void without faith, and that infants could not have faith, they were afterwards called Anabaptists, but they also held the tenets of the later Fifth Monarchy men in England. Like Luther they believed in the unfree will, but they carried the doctrine to greater lengths, and unlike him they found inspiration in the Apocalypse. They asserted the imminence of a bloody purification of the Church, and they endeavoured to verify their prophecy by beginning with the slaughter of their opponents at Zwickau. The plot was, however, discovered, and Storch, Munzer, and Stubner fled to Wittenberg.

Here they joined hands with Carlstadt and Zwilling. Even Melanchthon was impressed by their arguments, and the Elector Frederick, mindful of Gamaliel's advice, refused to move against them Early in 1522 iconoclastic riots broke out; priestly garments and auricular confession were disused; the abolition of the mendicant Orders was demanded, together with the distribution of the property of the religious corporations among the poor. The influence of Taborite dogma was shown by the agitation for closing all places of amusement and the denunciation of schools, universities, and all forms of learning as superfluous in a generation directly informed by the Holy Ghost. The Wittenberg schoolmaster, Mohr, himself besought parents to remove their children from school; students began to desert the University, and the New Learning seemed doomed to end in the domination of fanatical ignorance based on the brute force of the mob.

In the Edict of Worms Luther had been branded rather as a revolutionary than as a heretic, and the burden of the complaints preferred against him by the Catholic humanists was that his methods of seeking a reformation would be fatal to all order, political or ecclesiastical. They painted him as the apostle of revolution, a second Catiline; and the excesses at Wittenberg might well make them think themselves prophets. The moment was a crucial one; it was to decide whether or not the German Reformation was to follow the usual course of revolutions, devour its own children, and go on adopting ever extremer views till the day of reaction came. Of all the elements in revolt from Rome, Luther and his school were the most conservative, and upon the question whether he would prevail against the extreme faction depended the success or failure of the German Reformation.

The initial proceedings of Carlstadt had vexed Luther's soul, but he was violently antipathetic to the Zwickau enthusiasts. He vehemently repudiated their appeal to force in order to regenerate the Church. He recalled the fact that by spiritual methods alone he had routed Tetzel and his minions and defied with impunity both Emperor and Pope. He probably foresaw that the Reformation would be ruined by its association with the crude social democracy of Münzer and Storch, but in any case his personal instincts would alone have been sufficient to make him hostile; and when he had made up his mind to a course, no considerations of prudence or of his own safety could deter him from pursuing it. Braving the ban of the Empire and disregarding the Elector's stringent commands he left the Wartburg and reappeared at Wittenberg on March 6, 1522. His action required at least as much courage as his journey to Worms, and the demonstration of his influence was far more striking. In a course of eight sermons he rallied almost the whole of the town to his side. Zwilling confessed his errors; Carlstadt, Münzer, and Stübner soon departed to labour in other fields, and most of the work of destruction was repaired. Luther himself retained his cowl and lived in the Augustinian monastery, and scope was afforded for every man's scruples regarding the Mass; in one church it was celebrated with all the old Catholic rites, in another the Eucharist was administered in one or in both forms according to individual taste, and in a third the bread and the wine were always given to the laity.

Luther had vindicated the conservative character of the Reformation as he conceived it; he had checked the swing of the pendulum in one direction, and had thereby moderated the force of its recoil; but he could not prevent it from swinging back altogether. It had gone too far for that under the impetus supplied by himself, and a reaction based upon real conviction was slowly developing itself and coming to the rescue of the storm-tossed Catholic Church. The first force to react under the antagonism produced by the rejection of Catholic dogma was the humanist movement. The body was shattered, and some of its members joined the doctrinal Reformers; but the majority, including the great leader of the movement, took up a more and more hostile position. When Luther was thought to have been killed, many turned to Erasmus as Luther's successor. "Give ear, thou knight-errant of Christ," wrote Dürer, "ride on by the Lord Christ's side; defend the truth, reach forth to the martyr's crown." But that was a crown which Erasmus never desired; still less would he seek it in a cause which threatened to ruin his most cherished designs. Theology, he complained, bade fair to absorb all the humanities; and the theology of Luther was as hateful to him as that of Louvain. The dogmas, which appealed to men of the iron cast of Luther and Calvin, repelled cultured men of the world like Erasmus; for scholars and artists are essentially aristocratic in temperament and firmly attached to that doctrine of individual merit which Luther and

Calvin denied. While Luther adopted the teaching of St Augustine, Erasmus was regarded at Wittenberg as little better than a Pelagian, and his personal conflict with Hutten was soon followed by a more important encounter with Luther. Urged by Catholics to attack the new theology, Erasmus with intuitive skill selected the doctrine of free will, which he asserted in a treatise of great moderation. Luther's reply was remarkable for the unflinching way in which he accepted the logical consequences of his favourite dogma. But that did not make it more palatable, and Erasmus' book confirmed not a few in their antipathy to the Lutheran cause.

These were by no means blind partisans of the Papacy. Murner, the scholar and poet; Jerome Emser, the secretary to Duke George of Saxony; Cochlaeus, Heynlin von Stein, Alexander Hegius, Luther's old master Staupitz, Karl von Miltitz, Johann Faber, Pirkheimer, and many another had long desired a reformation of the Church, but they looked to a General Council and legal methods. Revolution and disruption they considered too great a price to pay for reform, and therefore sadly threw in their lot with the forces which were preparing to do battle for the Catholic Church, purified or corrupt. Slowly also a section of the German laity began to range itself on the same side, and from the confused *mêlée* of public opinion two organised parties gradually emerged. Here and there this or that form of religious belief obtained a decisive predominance and began to control the organisation of a city or principality in the interests of one or the other party. An infinity of local circumstances contributed to each local decision; dynastic conditions might assist a Prince to determine with which religious party to side, and relations with a neighbouring Bishop or even trading interests might exert a similar influence over the corporate conscience of cities. But with regard to Germany as a whole, and with a few significant exceptions, the frontiers of the Latin Church ultimately coincided to a remarkable extent with those of the old Roman Empire. Where the legions of the Caesars had planted their standards and founded their colonies, where the Latin speech and Latin civilisation had permeated the people, there in the sixteenth century the Roman Church retained its hold. The limits of the Roman Empire are in the main the boundaries between Teutonic and Latin Christianity.

But Latin Christianity saved itself in southern Germany only by borrowing some of the weapons of the original opponents of Rome, and the Counter-Reformation owed its success to its adoption of many of the practical proposals and some of the doctrinal ideas of the Reformation. The confiscation of Church property and the limitation of clerical prerogative went on apace in Catholic as well as in Protestant countries, and, while the spiritual prerogatives of the Papacy were magnified at the Council of Trent, its practical power declined. It secured secular aid by making concessions to the secular power. The earliest example

of this process was seen in Bavaria. Originally Bavaria had been as hostile to the Church as any other part of Germany, and no attempt was there made to execute the Edict of Worms. But what others sought by hostility to the Papacy, the Dukes of Bavaria won by its conciliation, and between 1521 and 1525 a firm alliance was built up between the Pope and the Dukes on the basis of papal support for the Dukes even against their Bishops. Adrian VI granted them a fifth of all ecclesiastical revenues within their dominions, a source of income which henceforth remained one of the chief pillars of the Bavarian financial system; and another Bull empowered the temporal tribunals to deal with heretics without the concurrence of the Bavarian Bishops, who resented the ducal intrusion into their jurisdictions. The territorial ambition of the Dukes was thus gratified; and the grievances of the laity against the Church were to some extent satisfied by the adoption of measures intended to reform clerical morals; and they both were thus inclined to defend Catholic dogma against Lutheran heresy. A similar grant of Church revenues to the Archduke Ferdinand for use against the Turk facilitated a like result; and Austria and Bavaria became the bulwarks of the Catholic Church in Germany. Other Catholic Princes, like Duke George of Saxony, maintained the faith with more disinterested motives but with less permanent success; while the ecclesiastical Electors of Mainz, Trier, and Cologne, were prevented by Lutheran sympathies in the chapters or in the cities of their dioceses from playing the vigorous part in opposition to the national movement which might otherwise have been expected from them.

A like process of crystallisation pervaded the Reforming party. In 1524 Luther effected the final conversion of the Elector Frederick of Saxony, and his brother John who succeeded him in the following year was already a Lutheran. In the same year the youthful and warlike Landgrave Philip of Hesse was won over by Melanchthon and enjoined the preaching of the Gospel throughout his territories. Margrave Casimir of Brandenburg took a similarly decisive step in concurrence with his Estates at Bayreuth in October. The banished Duke Ulrich of Wurttemberg was also a convert, and Duke Ernest of Lüneburg, a nephew of the Elector Frederick, began a reformation at Celle in 1524. Charles V's sister Isabella listened to Osiander's exhortations at Nurnberg and adopted the new ideas, and her husband, Christian II of Denmark, invited Luther and Carlstadt to preach in his kingdom. He was soon deprived of his throne, but his successor Frederick I adopted a similar religious attitude and promoted the spread of reforming principles in Denmark and in his duchies of Schleswig and Holstein. The Grand-master of the Teutonic Order, Albrecht of Brandenburg, had also been influenced by Osiander, and, turning his new faith to practical account, he converted the possessions of the Order into the hereditary duchy of Prussia, a fief of the Polish Crown, which received at once a purified

religion and a new constitution. In the neighbouring Duchy of Pomerania the Catholic Bogislav X was succeeded in 1523 by his two sons George and Barnim, of whom the latter was a Lutheran.

The feeble government established at the Diet of Worms in 1521 was quite unable to control this growing cleavage of the nation into two religious parties; but it made some efforts to steer a middle course and it reflected with some fidelity the national hostility to the papal Curia. It had met the Diet for the first time in February, 1522, and it entertained some hopes that the new Pope, Adrian VI, would do something to meet the long list of *gravamina* which had been drawn up in the previous year and sent to Rome for consideration; but it was late in the summer before Adrian reached the Vatican, and his policy could not be announced to the Diet until its next meeting in November. The papal Nuncio was Francesco Chieregati, an experienced diplomatist, and he came with a conciliatory message. He said nothing about Luther in his first speech to the Diet, and in an interview with Planitz, the Elector Frederick's Chancellor, he admitted the existence of grave abuses in the Papacy, and the partial responsibility of Leo X for them; nor did he deny that Luther had done good work in bringing these abuses to light; though of course the monk's attacks on the sacraments, on the Fathers of the Church, and on Councils could not be tolerated. But this peaceful atmosphere did not endure. Adrian seems to have come to the conclusion that his instructions to Chieregati did not lay sufficient emphasis on papal dignity, and a brief which he addressed to his Nuncio on November 25 was much more minatory. His threats were conveyed to the Diet by Chieregati's speech on January 3, 1523; Luther was denounced as worse than the Turk, and was accused of not merely polluting Germany with his heresy but of aiming at the destruction of all order and property. The Estates were reminded of the end of Dathan and Abiram, of Ananias and Sapphira, of Jerome and Hus; if they separated themselves from God's Holy Church they might incur a similar fate.

Yet the Pope did not deny the abuses of which complaint had been made, and his frank acknowledgement of them supplied the Diet with a cue for their answer. They refused the Nuncio's demand that the Lutheran preachers of Nurnberg should be seized and sent to Rome, and appointed a committee to deal with the question. This body reported that the Pope's acknowledgement of the existence of abuses made it impossible to proceed against Luther for pointing them out; and it carried war into the enemy's territory by demanding that the Pope should surrender German annates to be appropriated to German national purposes, and summon a Council, in which the laity were to be represented, to sit in some German town and deal with the ecclesiastical situation. This report met with some opposition from the Elector Joachim of Brandenburg, Duke George of Saxony, and the

Archduke Ferdinand; but the modifications adopted by the Diet did not seriously alter its import. The Elector Frederick was to be asked to restrain Luther, but probably no one anticipated that his efforts, if he made any, would be successful; no steps were to be taken to execute the Edict of Worms or to silence the Reformers; the Diet reiterated its hundred *gravamina*, and, although no approbation was expressed of Luther and his cause, the outlawed monk had as much reason to be pleased with the results of the Diet as Chieregati had to be discontented.

Before the Diet assembled again the reforming Adrian had gone the way of his predecessors, and popular feeling at Rome towards reform was expressed by the legend inscribed on the door of the dead Pope's physician *Liberatori patriae.* Another Medici sat on the throne of Leo X, and religious reform was exchanged for family politics. But even Clement VII felt the necessity of grappling with the German problem, and Lorenzo Campeggio was sent to the Diet which again met at Nürnberg in January, 1524. As he entered Augsburg and gave his benediction to the crowd, he was met with jeers and insults. At Nürnberg, which he reached on March 16, the Princes advised him to make a private entry for fear of hostile demonstrations, and on Maundy Thursday under his very eyes three thousand people, including the Emperor's sister, received the communion in both forms. His mission seemed a forlorn hope, but there were a few breaks in the gloom. The *Reichsregiment*, which had on the whole been more advanced in religious opinion than the Diets, had lost the respect of the people. The repudiation of its authority by the towns, the knights, and several of the Princes, with the encouragement of the Emperor, indicated the speedy removal of this shield of Lutheranism, and the vote of censure carried against the government seemed to open the door to reaction.

Campeggio accordingly again demanded the execution of the Edict of Worms, and he was supported by Charles V's Chancellor, Hannart, who had been sent from Spain to aid the cities in their resistance to the financial proposals of the *Reichsregiment.* But the cities, in spite of their repudiation of Lutheranism in Spain, were now indignant at the idea of enforcing the Edict of Worms, and the Diet itself was angry because Campeggio brought no other answer to its repeated complaints than the statement that the Holy Father could not believe such a document to be the work of the Estates of the Holy Roman Empire. So the old struggle was fought over again, and the inevitable compromise differed only in shades of meaning from that of the previous year. The Edict should, indeed, be executed "as well as they were able, and as far as was possible"; but the Estates did not profess any greater ability than before. A General Council was again demanded, and pending its not very probable or speedy assemblage, a national Synod was to be summoned to meet at Speier in November, and there make an interim settlement of all the practical and doctrinal questions at issue.

The prospect of such a meeting alarmed both Pope and Emperor more than all the demands for a General Council; for in a General Council the Germans would be a minority, and General Councils afforded unlimited scope for delay. But a German Synod would mean business, and its business was not likely to please either Clement or Charles. It would probably organise a German national Church with slight dependence on Rome; it might establish a national government with no more dependence on Charles. Both these threatened interests took action; the Pope instigated Henry VIII to take away from the German merchants of the Steelyard their commercial privileges, and to urge upon Charles the prohibition of the meeting at Speier; he also suggested the deposition of the Elector Frederick as a warning to other rebellious Princes. The Emperor was nothing loth; on July 15 he forbade the proposed assembly at Speier, and, although there is no evidence that he would have proceeded to so dangerous and violent a measure as the deposition of Frederick, he broke off former friendly relations and insulted the whole Saxon House by marrying his sister Catharine to King John of Portugal instead of to Frederick's nephew, John Frederick, to whom she had been betrothed as the price of the Elector's support of Charles' candidature for the Empire in 1519.

Before the news of these steps had reached Germany both sides had begun preparations for the struggle. Campeggio had been empowered, in case of the failure of his mission to the Diet, to organise a sectional gathering of Catholic Princes in order to frustrate the threatened national Council. This assembly, the first indication of the permanent religious disruption of Germany, met at Ratisbon towards the end of June. Its principal members were the Archduke Ferdinand, the two Dukes of Bavaria, and nine bishops of southern Germany; and the anti-national character of the meeting was emphasised by the abstinence of every elector, lay or clerical. It was, however, something more than a particularist gathering; it sought to take the wind out of the sails of the Reformation by reforming the Church from within, and it was in fact a Counter-Reformation in miniature. The spiritual lords consented to pay a fifth of their revenues to the temporal authority as the price of the suppression of Lutheran doctrine. The grievances of the laity with respect to clerical fees and clerical morals were to some extent redressed; the excessive number of saints' days and holy days was curtailed. The use of excommunication and interdict for trivial matters was forbidden; and while the reading of Lutheran books was prohibited, preachers were enjoined to expound the Scriptures according to the teaching, not of medieval schoolmen, but of the great Fathers of the Church, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Augustine, Jerome, Ambrose, and Gregory. Eck published a collection of *Loci Communes* to counteract Melanchthon's, and Emser a version of the Bible to correct Luther's, and a systematic persecution of heretics was commenced in the territories of the parties to the conference.

Meanwhile, in ignorance of the impending blow, the greater part of Germany was preparing for the national Council or Synod at Speier. The news of the convention at Ratisbon stimulated the Reformers' zeal. The cities held meetings first at Speier and then at Ulm, where they were joined by representatives of the nobles of the Rhine districts, the Eifel, Wetterau, and Westerwald. They bound themselves to act together, and ordered preachers to confine themselves to the Gospel and the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures. These gatherings represented but a fraction of the strength of the party of doctrinal reform. The almost simultaneous adoption of Lutheranism by Prussia, Silesia, and part of Pomerania, by Brandenburg-Culmbach, and by Hesse, Brunswick-Luneburg, Schleswig, and Holstein proves that the proposed national Council at Speier would have commanded the allegiance of the greater part of north Germany, and might, through its adherents in great cities like Strassburg, Augsburg, and Ulm, have swept even the south within the net of a national revolt from Rome. That consummation was postponed by the united action of Charles, of Clement, and of the Princes and Bishops at Ratisbon; but the Empire was riven in twain, and while the rival parties were debating each other's destruction, the first rumblings were heard of a storm which threatened to overwhelm them both in a common ruin. The peasant, to whom scores of ballads and satires had lightly appealed as the arbiter of the situation, was coming to claim his own, and the social revolution was at hand.

CHAPTER VI.

SOCIAL REVOLUTION AND CATHOLIC REACTION IN GERMANY.

THE most frequent and damaging charge levelled at Luther between 1520 and 1525 reproached him with being the apostle of revolution and anarchy, and predicted that his attacks on spiritual authority would develop into a campaign against civil order unless he were promptly suppressed. The indictment had been preferred in the Edict of Worms, it was echoed by the Nuncio two years later at Nurnberg, and it was the ground of the humanist revolt from his ranks. By his denunciations of Princes in 1523 and 1524 as being for the most part the greatest fools or the greatest rogues on earth, by his application of the text "He hath put down the mighty from their seats," and by his assertion of the principle that human authority might be resisted when its mandates conflicted with the Word of God, Luther had confirmed the suspicion. There was enough truth in it to give point to Murner's satire of Luther as the champion of the *Bundschuh*, the leader of those who proclaimed that, as Christ had freed them all, and all were children and heirs of one father, all should share alike, all be priests and gentlemen, and pay rents and respect to no man. The outbreak of the Peasants' War appeared to be an invincible corroboration of the charge, and from that day to this it has been almost a commonplace with Catholic historians that the Reformation was the parent of the revolt.

It has been no less a point of honour with Protestant writers, and especially with Germans, to vindicate both the man and the movement from the taint of revolution. The fact that the peasants adopted the Lutheran phrases about brotherly love and Christian liberty proves little, for in a theological age it is difficult to express any movement except in theological terms, and behind these common phrases there lay a radical divergence of aims and methods. The Gospel according to Luther may have contained a message for villeins and serfs, but it did not proclaim the worldly redemption they sought; and the motives of the peasants in 1525 were similar to those which had precipitated half-a-dozen local revolts before Luther appeared on the scene. Even

in 1524 the earliest sets of articles propounded by the peasants contained no mention of religious reform.

And yet the assertion that there was no connexion between the Reformation and the Peasants' Revolt is as far from the truth as the statement that the one produced the other. The frequent association of religious and social movements excludes the theory of mere coincidence. Wat Tyler trod on the heels of Wiclif, and Ziska on those of Hus; Kett appeared at the dawn of English Puritanism, and the Levellers at its zenith. When one house is blown up, its neighbour is sure to be shaken, especially if both stand on the same foundation; and all government, whether civil or ecclesiastical, rests ultimately on the same basis. It is not reason, it is not law, still less is it force; it is mainly custom and habit. Without a voluntary and unreasoning adherence to custom and deference to authority all society and all government would be impossible; and the disturbance of this habit in any one respect weakens the forces of law and order in all. When habit is broken, reason and passion are called into play, and it would be hard to say which is more fatal to human institutions. The Reformation had by an appeal to reason and passion destroyed the habit of unreasoning obedience to the Papacy, and less venerable institutions inevitably felt the shock.

This appeal against habit and custom was made to the peasant more directly than to any other class. Popular literature and popular art erected him into a sort of saviour of society. In scores of dialogues he intervenes and confounds with his common sense the learning of doctors of law and theology; he knows as much of the Scriptures as three parsons and more; and in his typical embodiment as *Karsthans* he demolishes the arguments of Luther's antagonist, Murner. He is the hero of nearly all contemporary pamphlets; with his hoe and his flail he will defend the Gospel if it comes to fighting; and even Luther himself, when Sickingen had failed, sought to frighten Princes and Prelates with the peasant's spectre. The peasant was the unknown factor of the situation; his power was incalculable, but it would not be exerted in favour of existing institutions, and when hard pressed the religious Reformers were prepared, like Frankenstein, to call into existence a being over which their control was imperfect.

The discontent of the peasantry in Germany, as in other countries of Europe, had been a painfully obvious fact for more than a generation, and since 1490 it had broken out in revolts in Elsass, in the Netherlands, in Wurttemberg, at Kempten, at Bruchsal, and in Hungary. The device of the peasant's shoe, whence their league acquired the name of *Bundschuh*, had been adopted as early as 1493, and again in 1502; and the electoral Princes themselves had admitted that the common people were burdened with feudal services, taxes, ecclesiastical Courts, and other exactions, which would eventually prove intolerable. Hans Rosenblut complained before the end of the fifteenth century that

the nobles were constantly demanding more and more from the peasant; and the process of extortion did not slacken in the succeeding years. The noble himself was feeling the weight of the economic revolution, of the increase in prices, and depression in agriculture; and he naturally sought to shift it from his own shoulders to those of his villeins and serfs, that lowest substratum of society on which all burdens ultimately rest. He endeavoured to redress the relative depreciation in the value of land by increasing the amount of rent and services which he received from its tillers.

Nor was this the only trouble in which the peasants were involved. The evil of enclosures, although it was felt in Germany, was not so prominent among their complaints as it was in England; but their general distress produced two other symptoms, one of which seems to have been peculiar to those districts of Germany in which the revolt raged with the greatest fury. In the south-west, in the valleys of the Tauber and the Neckar, in the Moselle and middle Rhine districts, the practice of subdividing land had proceeded so far that the ordinary holding of the peasant had shrunk to the quarter of a ploughland; and the effort to check this ruinous development only resulted in the creation of a landless agrarian proletariat. The other process, which was not confined to Germany, was the conversion of land into a speculative market for money. The financial embarrassments of the peasant rendered him an easy prey to the burgher-capitalist who lent him money on the security of his holding, the interest on which was often not forthcoming if the harvest failed, or the plague attacked his cattle; and the traffic in rents, which inevitably bore hardly on the tenant, was one of the somewhat numerous evils which Luther at one time or another declared to be the ruin of the German nation.

Besides these economic causes, the growing influence of Roman law affected the peasant even more than it had done the barons. By it, said the Emperor Maximilian, the poor man either got no justice at all against the rich, or it was so sharp and fine-pointed that it availed him nothing. Ignoring the fine distinctions of feudal law with respect to service it regarded the rendering of service as proof of servitude, and everyone who was not entirely free sank in its eyes to a serf. The policy of reducing tenants to this position was systematically pursued in many districts; the Abbots of Kempten resorted not merely to the falsification of charters but to such abuse of their clerical powers as refusing the Sacrament to those who denied their servitude; and one of them defended his conduct on the ground that he was only doing as other lords. It was in fact the lords and not the peasants who were the revolutionists; the revolt was essentially reactionary. The peasants demanded the restoration of their old *Haingerichte* and other Courts, the abolition of novel jurisdictions and new exactions of rent and service. The movement was an attempt to revive the worn-out communal system

of the Middle Ages, and a socialistic protest against the individualistic tendencies of the time.

The peasant's condition was fruitful soil for the seeds of a gospel of discontent. The aristocratic humanist revival awoke no echoes in his breast, but he found balm of Gilead in Luther's denunciations of merchants as usurers, of lawyers as robbers, and in his assertion of the worthlessness of all things compared with the Word of God, which peasants could understand better than priests. More radical preachers supplied whatever was lacking in Luther's doctrine to complete their exaltation. Carlstadt improved on Luther's declaration that peasants knew more of the Scriptures than learned doctors by affirming that they certainly knew more than Luther. Peasants adopted with fervour the doctrine of universal priesthood, and began themselves to preach and baptise. Schappeler announced at Memmingen that heaven was open to peasants, but closed to nobles and clergy. But while this was heresy, it was hardly sedition; most of the preachers believed as Luther did, in the efficacy of the Word, and repudiated Münzer's appeal to the sword; and the promise of heaven hereafter might be expected to reconcile rather than to exasperate the peasant with his lot on earth. Yet it exerted an indirect stimulus, for men do not rebel in despair, but in hope; and the spiritual hopes held out by the Gospel produced that quickening of his mind, without which the peasant would never have risen to end his temporal ills.

The outbreak in 1524 can only have caused surprise by its extent, for that the peasants would rise was a common expectation. Almanacks and astrologers predicted the storm with remarkable accuracy; indeed its mutterings had been heard for years, and in 1522 friends of the exiled Ulrich of Württemberg had discussed a plan for his restoration to the duchy by means of a peasant revolt. But the first step in the great movement was not due to Ulrich or to any other extraneous impulse. It was taken in June, 1524, on the estates of Count Siegmund von Lupfen at Stuhlingen, some miles to the north-west of Schaffhausen. There had already been a number of local disturbances elsewhere, and the peasantry round Nürnberg had burnt their tithes on the field; but they had all been suppressed without difficulty. The rising at Stühlingen is traditionally reported to have been provoked by a whim of the Countess von Lupfen, who insisted upon the Count's tenants spending a holiday in collecting snail-shells on which she might wind her wool; and this trivial reason has been remembered, to the oblivion of the more weighty causes alleged by the peasants in their list of grievances. They complained of the enclosure of woods, the alienation of common lands, and the denial of their right to fish in streams; they were compelled, they said, to do all kinds of field-work for their lord and his steward, to assist at hunts, to draw ponds and streams without any regard to the necessities of their own avocations; the lord's streams were diverted across their

fields, while water necessary for irrigating their meadows and turning their mills was cut off, and their crops were ruined by huntsmen trampling them down. They accused their lord of abusing his jurisdiction, of inflicting intolerable punishments, and of appropriating stolen goods; and in short they declared that they could no longer look for justice at his hands, or support their wives and families in face of his exactions.

These articles, which number sixty-two in all, are as remarkable for what they omit as for what they include. There is no trace of a religious element in them, no indication that their authors had ever heard of Luther or of the Gospel. They are purely agrarian in character, their language is moderate, and, if the facts are stated correctly, their demands are extremely reasonable. In its origin the Peasants' Revolt bore few traces of the intellectual and physical violence which marked its later course. It began like a trickling stream in the highlands; as it flowed downwards it was joined first by one and then by another revolutionary current, till it united in one torrent all elements of disorder and threatened to inundate the whole of Germany.

When once the movement had started, it quickly gathered momentum. A thousand tenants from the Stuhlingen district assembled with such arms as they could collect, and chose as their captain Hans Muller of Bulgenbach, an old *landsknecht* who showed more talent for organisation than most of the peasants' leaders. In August he made his way south to Waldshut, probably with the object of obtaining the co-operation of the discontented proletariate in the towns. The towns had been permeated with new religious ideas to an extent which was almost unknown in the country, the upper classes by Lutheranism, the lower by notions of which Carlstadt and Münzer were the chief exponents. Waldshut itself was in revolt against its Austrian government, which had initiated a savage persecution of heretics in the neighbourhood and demanded from the citizens the surrender of their preacher, Balthasar Hubmaier. It was thus predisposed to favour the peasants' cause, but the often repeated statement that Müller, in August, 1524, succeeded in establishing an Evangelical Brotherhood is incorrect. That scheme, which probably emanated from the towns, was not effected until the meeting at Memmingen in the following February; and the intervening winter elapsed without open conflict between the peasants and the authorities. The Archduke Ferdinand's attention was absorbed by the momentous struggle then being waged in North Italy, and every available *landsknecht* had been sent to swell the armies of Charles V. The Swabian League, the only effective organisation in South Germany, could muster but two thousand troops, and recourse was had to negotiations at Stockach which were not seriously meant on the part of the lords. Many of the peasants, however, returned home on the understanding that none but ancient services should be exacted; but the lords,

thinking that the storm had blown over, resorted to their usual practices and made little endeavour to conclude the *pourparlers* at Stockach. As a result the insurrection broke out afresh, and was extended into a wider area.

In October and November, 1524, there were risings of the peasants all round the Lake of Constance, in the Allgau, the Klettgau, the Hegau, the Thurgau, and north-west of Stühlingen at Villingen. Further to the east, on the Iller in Upper Swabia, the tenants of the abbey of Kempten, who had long nursed grievances against their lords, rose, and in February, 1525, assembled at Sonthofen; they declared that they would have no more lords, a revolutionary demand which indicates that their treatment by the abbots had been worse than that of the Lupfen tenants. The peasants of the Donauried (N.W. of Augsburg) had been agitating throughout the winter, and by the first week in February four thousand of them met at Baltringen, some miles to the north of Biberach; before the end of the month their numbers had risen to thirty thousand. They were also joined by bands called the *Seehaufen*, from the northern shores of Lake Constance, while Hans Müller made an incursion into the Breisgau and raised the peasants of the Black Forest.

As the rebellion extended its area the scope of its objects grew wider, and it assimilated revolutionary ideas distinct from the agrarian grievances which had originally prompted the rising. A religious element began to obtrude, and its presence was probably due to the fact that it supplied a convenient banner under which heterogeneous forces might fight; Sickingen had adopted a similar expedient to cloak the sectional aims of the knights, and men now began to regard the revolt as a rising on behalf of the Gospel. In this light it was viewed by the neighbouring city of Zurich, where Zwingli's influence was now all-powerful; and the Zurich government exhorted the Klettgau peasants to adopt the Word of God as their banner. In conformity with this advice they gave a religious colour to their demands, and in January, 1525, offered to grant their lord whatever was reasonable, godly, and Christian, if he on his side would undertake to abide by the Word of God and righteousness. So, too, the Baltringen bands declared that they wished to create no disturbance, but only desired that their grievances should be redressed in accord with godly justice; and in the Allgau, where the peasant Häberlin had preached and baptised, the peasants formed themselves into a "godly union." On the other hand the Lake bands, with whom served some remnants of Sickingen's host, appear to have been more intent upon a political attack on lords and cities.

In March all these bodies held a sort of parliament at Memmingen, the chief town of Upper Swabia, to concert a common basis of action, and here the Zurich influence carried the day. Schappeler, Zwingli's friend, had been preaching at Memmingen on the iniquity of tithes, and

if he did not actually pen the famous Twelve Articles there formulated, they were at least drawn up under his inspiration and that of his colleague Lotzer. They embody ideas of wider import than are likely to have occurred to bands of peasants concerned with specific local grievances; and throughout the movement it is obvious that, while the peasants supplied the physical force and their hardships the real motive, the intellectual inspiration came from the radical element in the towns. This element was not so obvious at Memmingen as it became later on, and its chief effect there was to give a religious aspect to the revolt and to merge its local character in a universal appeal to the peasant, based on ideas of fraternal love and Christian liberty drawn from the Gospel.

This programme was not adopted without some difference of opinion, in which the Lake bands led the opposition. But the proposal of an Evangelical Brotherhood was accepted on March 7; and the Twelve Articles, founded apparently upon a memorial previously presented by the people of Memmingen to their town Council, were then drawn up. The preamble repudiated the idea that the insurgents' "new Gospel" implied the extirpation of spiritual and temporal authority; on the contrary, they quoted texts to show that its essence was love, peace, patience, and unity, and that the aim of the peasants was that all men should live in accord with its precepts. As means thereto they demanded that the choice of pastors should be vested in each community, which should also have power to remove such as behaved unseemly. The great tithes they were willing to pay, and they proposed measures for their collection and for the application of the surplus to the relief of the poor, and, in case of necessity, to the expenses of war or to meet the demands of the tax-gatherer; but the small tithes they would not pay, because God had created the beasts of the field as a free gift for the use of mankind. They would no longer be villeins, because Christ had made all men free; but they would gladly obey such authority as was elected and set over them, so it be by God appointed. They claimed the right to take ground game, fowls, and fish in flowing water; they demanded the restoration of woods, meadows, and ploughlands to the community, the renunciation of new-fangled services, and payment of peasants for those which they rendered, the establishment of judicial rents, the even administration of justice, and the abolition of death-dues, which ruined widows and orphans. Finally, they required that all their grievances should be tested by the Word of God; if aught which they had demanded were proved to be contrary to Scripture, they agreed to give it up, even though the demand had been granted; and on the other hand they asked that their lords should submit to the same test, and relinquish any privileges which might hereafter be shown to be inconsistent with the Scriptures, although they were not included in the present list of grievances.

On the basis of these demands negotiations were reopened with

the Swabian League at Ulm, but they were not more successful or sincere than those at Stockach. The League rejected an offer of mediation made by the Council of Regency which now sat with diminished prestige at Esslingen; and, though the discussions were continued, they were only designed to give Truchsess, the general of the League, time to gather his forces: even during the progress of the negotiations he had attacked and massacred unsuspecting bands of Hegau peasants, till his victorious progress was checked by the advent of a different foe.

Ulrich, the exiled Duke of Wurttemberg, and his party constituted one of the discontented elements which were certain to rally to any revolutionary standard. He had announced his intention of regaining his duchy with the help of "spur or shoe," of knights or peasants. The former hope was quenched by Sickingen's fall, but as soon as the peasants rose Ulrich began to cultivate their friendship; in the autumn of 1524, from Hohentwiel, of which he had recovered possession, on the confines of the territory of his Swiss protectors and of the disturbed Hegau, he established relations with the insurgents, and took to signing his name "Utz the Peasant." In February, 1525, he resolved to tempt his fate; supported by ten thousand hired Swiss infantry he crossed the border and invaded Württemberg. The civil and religious oppression of the Austrian rule had to some extent wiped out the memory of Ulrich's own harsh government, and he was able to occupy Ballingen, Herrenberg, and Sindelfingen without serious opposition, and to lay siege to Stuttgart on March 9. The news brought Truchsess into Wurttemberg; but Ulrich was on the eve of success when the tidings came of the battle of Pavia (February 24). Switzerland might need all her troops for her own defence, and those serving under Ulrich's banner were promptly summoned home. There was nothing left for Ulrich but flight so soon as Truchsess appeared upon the scene; and the restoration of Austrian authority in Württemberg enabled the general of the Swabian League once more to turn his arms against the peasants.

But the respite, short as it was, had given the revolt time to spread in all directions, and before the end of April almost the whole of Germany, except the north and east and Bavaria in the south, was in an uproar. From Upper Swabia the movement spread in March to the lower districts of the circle. Round Leipheim on the Danube to the north-east of Ulm the peasants rose under a priest named Jacob Wehe, attacked Leipheim and Weissenhorn, and stormed the castle of Roggenburg, while a considerable portion of Truchsess' troops sympathised with their cause and refused to serve against them. Even so, the remainder, consisting mostly of veterans returned from Pavia, were sufficient to crush the Leipheim contingent, whose incompetence and cowardice contrasted strongly with the behaviour of the Swiss and Bohemian peasants in previous wars. They fled into Leipheim almost as soon as Truchsess

appeared, losing a third of their numbers in the retreat; the town thereupon surrendered at discretion; and Jacob Wehe was discovered hiding, and executed outside the walls. Truchsess now turned back to crush the contingents from the Lake and the Hegau and the Baltringen band, which had captured Waldsee and was threatening his own castle at Waldburg. He defeated the latter near Wurzach on April 13, but was less successful with the former, who were entrenched near Weingarten. They were double the number of Truchsess' troops, and after a distant cannonade the Swabian general consented to negotiate; the peasants, alarmed perhaps by the fate of their allies, were induced to disband on the concession of some of their demands and the promise of an inquiry into the rest.

Truchsess had every reason to be satisfied with this result, for from all sides appeals were pouring in for help. In the Hegau Radolfzell was besieged; to the south-east the cardinal archbishop of Salzburg, Matthew Lang, was soon shut up in his castle by his subjects of the city and neighbouring country, while the Archduke Ferdinand himself would not venture outside the walls of Innsbruck. Forty thousand peasants had risen in the Vorarlberg; Tyrol was in ferment from end to end; and in Styria Dietrichstein's Bohemian troops could not save him from defeat at the hands of the peasants. In the south-west Hans Muller, the leader of the Stuhlingen force, moved through the Black Forest, and raising the Breisgau villagers appeared before Freiburg. The fortress on the neighbouring Schlossberg was unable to protect the city, which admitted the peasants on May 24. Across the Rhine in Elsass twenty thousand insurgents captured Zabern on May 13, and made themselves masters of Weissenburg and most of the other towns in the province; Colmar alone withstood their progress. Further north in the west Rhine districts of the Palatinate, Lauterburg, Landau, and Neustadt fell into the rebels' hands, and on the east side of the river they carried all before them. In the Odenwald George Metzler, an innkeeper, had raised the standard of revolt before the end of March, and Jacklein Rohrbach followed his example in the Neckarthal on the first of April. Florian Geyer headed the Franconian rebels who gathered in the valley of the Tauber, and the Austrian government in Wurttemberg had barely got rid of Ulrich when it was threatened by a more dangerous enemy in the peasants under Matern Feuerbacher. Further north still, the Thuringian commons broke out under the lead of Thomas Munzer.

So widespread a movement inevitably gathered into its net personalities and forces of every description. The bulk of the insurgents and some of their leaders were peasants; but willingly or unwillingly they received into their ranks criminals, priests, ex-officials, barons, and even some ruling Princes. Florian Geyer was a knight more or less of Sickingen's type, who threw himself heart and soul into the peasants' cause. Götz von Berlichingen, the hero of Goethe's drama known as Götz of the Iron

Hand—he had lost one hand in battle—came from the same class. In his memoirs he represents his complicity in the revolt as the result of compulsion, but before there was any question of force he had given vent to such sentiments as that the knights suffered as much from the Princes' oppression as did the peasants, and his action was probably more voluntary than he afterwards cared to admit. The lower clergy, many of them drawn from the peasants, naturally sympathised with the class from which they sprang, and they had no cause to dislike a movement which aimed at a redistribution of the wealth of Princes and Bishops; in some cases all the inmates of a monastery except the abbot willingly joined the insurgents. Some of the leaders were respectable innkeepers like Matern Feuerbacher, but others were roysterers such as Jacklein Rohrbach, and among their followers were many recruits from the criminal classes. These baser elements often thrust aside the better, and by their violence brought odium upon the whole movement. The peasants had indeed contemplated the use of force from the beginning, and those who refused to join the Evangelical Brotherhood were to be put under a ban, or in modern phraseology, subjected to a boycott; but the burning of castles and monasteries seems first to have been adopted in retaliation for Truchsess' destruction of peasants' dwellings, and for the most part the insurgents' misdeeds arose from a natural inability to resist the temptations of seigneurial fishponds and wine-cellars.

No less heterogeneous than the factors of which the revolutionary horde was composed were the ideas and motives by which it was moved. There was many a private and local grudge as well as class and common grievances. In Salzburg the Archbishop had retained feudal privileges from which most German cities were free; in the Austrian duchies there was a German national feeling against the repressive rule of Ferdinand's Spanish ministers; religious persecution helped the revolt at Brixen, for Strauss and Urbanus Rhegius had there made many converts to Luther's Gospel; others complained of the tyranny of mine-owners like the Fuggers and other capitalist rings; and in not a few districts the rising assumed the character of a *Judenhetze*. The peasants all over Germany were animated mainly by the desire to redress agrarian grievances, but hatred of prelatical wealth and privilege and of the voracious territorial power of Princes was a bond which united merchants and knights, peasants and artisans, in a common hostility.

Gradually, too, the development of the movement led to the production of various manifestoes or rather crude suggestions for the establishment of a new political and social organisation. Some of them were foreshadowed in a scheme put forward by Eberlin in 1521, which may not, however, have been more seriously intended than Sir Thomas More's *Utopia*. Its pervading principle was that of popular election; each village was to choose a gentleman as its magistrate; two hundred chief places were to select a knight for their bailiff; each ten bailiwicks

were to be organised under a city, and each ten cities under a Duke or Prince. One of the Princes was to be elected King, but he, like every subordinate officer, was to be guided by an elected Council. In this scheme town was throughout subordinate to country; half the members of the Councils were to be peasants and half nobles, and agriculture was pronounced the noblest means of sustenance. Capitalist organisations were abolished; the importation of wine and cloth was forbidden, and that of corn only conceded in time of scarcity; and the price of wine and bread was to be fixed. Only articles of real utility were to be manufactured, and every form of luxury was to be suppressed. Drastic measures were proposed against vice, and drunkards and adulterers were to be punished with death All children were to be taught Latin, Greek, Hebrew, astronomy, and medicine.

This Utopian scheme was too fanciful even for the most imaginative peasant leaders, but their proposals grew rapidly more extravagant. The local demand for the abolition of seigneurial rights gave place to universal ideas of liberty, fraternity, equality; and it is scarcely an exaggeration to say that the German peasants in 1525 anticipated most of the French ideas of 1789. The Twelve Articles of the Elsass peasants went beyond the originals of Memmingen in demanding not only the popular election of pastors but of all officials, and the right of the people to repudiate or recognise princely authority. So, too, the peasants' parliament at Meran in the Tyrol insisted that all jurisdictions should be exercised by persons chosen by the community. It was perhaps hostility to the Princes rather than perception of national needs that prompted the agitation for the reduction of all Princes to the status of lieutenants of the Emperor, who was to be recognised as the one and only sovereign ruler; but the conception of a democratic Empire had taken strong hold of the popular imagination. Hipler and Weigant, two of the clearest thinkers of the revolution, suggested writing to Charles and representing the movement as aimed at two objects dear to his heart, the reformation of his Church and the subjection of the Princes to obedience to the Empire. They, no less than the English, preferred a popular despotism to feudal anarchy. Even the conservative Swabians desired the abolition of a number of petty intermediate jurisdictions; and in more radical districts the proposed vindication of the Emperor's power was coupled with the condition that it was to be wielded in the people's interest. The Kaiser was to be the minister, and his subjects the sovereign authority.

Between this ruler and his people there were to be no intervening grades of society. Equality was an essential condition of the new order of things. Nobles like the counts of Hohenlohe and Henneberg, who swore through fear the oath imposed by the rebels, were required to dismantle their castles, to live in houses like peasants and burghers, to eat the same food and wear the same dress; they were even forbidden to

ride on horseback, because it raised them above their fellows. Except he became as a peasant the noble could not enter the kingdom of brotherly love. Who, it was asked, made the first noble, and had not a peasant five fingers to his hand like a prince? Still more attractive than the proposed equality of social standing was the suggested equality of worldly goods; and, though in the latter case the ideal no doubt was that of levelling up and not of levelling down, it was declared enough for any man to possess two thousand crowns.

It might well be inferred, even if it had not been stated by the peasants themselves, that they derived these ideas from teachers in towns; and it was the co-operation of the town proletariate which made the revolt so formidable, especially in Franconia and Thuringia. A civic counterpart of Eberlin's peasant Utopia was supplied by a political pamphlet entitled *The Needs of the German Nation, or The Reformation of Frederick III.* As in the case of the Twelve Articles of Memmingen, the principle of Christian liberty was to be the basis of the new organisation; but it was here applied specifically to the conditions of the poorer classes in towns. Tolls, dues, and especially indirect taxes should be abolished; the capital of individual merchants and of companies was to be limited to ten thousand crowns; the coinage, weights, and measures were to be reduced to a uniform standard; the Roman civil and canon law to be abolished, ecclesiastical property to be confiscated, and clerical participation in secular trades—against which several Acts of the English Reformation parliament were directed—to be prohibited.

Some of these grievances, especially those against the Church, were common to rich and poor alike, but socialistic and communistic ideas naturally tended to divide every town and city into two parties, and the struggle resolved itself into one between the commune, representing the poor, and the Council, representing the well-to-do. This contest was fought out in most of the towns in Germany; and its result determined the amount of sympathy with which each individual town regarded the peasants' cause. But nowhere do the cities appear to have taken an active part against the revolution, for they all felt that the Princes threatened them as much as they did the peasants. Waldshut and Memmingen from the first were friendly; Zurich rendered active assistance; and there was a prevalent fear that the towns of Switzerland and Swabia would unite in support of the movement. The strength shown by the peasants exercised a powerful influence over the intramural struggles of commune and Council, and in many of the smaller towns and cities the commune gained the upper hand. Such was the case at Heilbronn, at Rothenburg, where Carlstadt had been active, and at Wurzburg. At Frankfort the proletariate formed an organisation which they declared to be Council, Burgomaster, Pope, and Emperor all rolled into one; and most of the small cities opened their gates to the peasants,

either because they felt unable to stand a siege or because the commune was relatively stronger in the smaller than in the bigger cities. The latter were by no means unaffected by the general ferment, but their agitations were less directly favourable to the peasants. In several, such as Strassburg, there were iconoclastic riots; in Catholic cities like Mainz, Cologne, and Ratisbon the citizens demanded the abolition of the Council's financial control, the suppression of indirect taxation, and the extirpation of clerical privilege; in others again their object was merely to free themselves from the feudal control of their lords; while in Bamberg and Speier they were willing to admit the lordship of the Bishops, but demanded the secularisation of their property. In one form or another the spirit of rebellion pervaded the cities from Brixen to Munster and Osnabruck, and from Strassburg to Stralsund and Dantzig.

The most extreme embodiment of the revolutionary spirit was found in Thomas Munzer, to whose influence the whole movement has sometimes been ascribed. After his expulsion from Zwickau he fled to Prague, where he announced his intention of following the example of Hus. His views, however, resembled more closely those of the extreme Hussite sect known as Taborites, and their proximity to Bohemia may explain the reception which the Thuringian cities of Allstedt and Mühlhausen accorded to Munzer's ideas. At Allstedt his success was great both among the townsfolk and the peasants; here he was established as a preacher and married a wife; here he preached his theocratic doctrines, which culminated in the assertion that the godless had no right to live, but should be exterminated by the sword of the elect. He also developed communistic views, and maintained that lords who withheld from the community the fish in the water, fowl of the air, and produce of the soil were breaking the commandment not to steal. Property in fact, though it was left to a more modern communist to point the epigram, was theft. The Elector Frederick would have tolerated even this doctrine; but his brother Duke John and his cousin Duke George secured in July, 1524, Münzer's expulsion from Allstedt. He found an asylum in the imperial city of Muhlhausen, where a runaway monk, Heinrich Pfeiffer, had already raised the small trades against the aristocratic Council; but two months later the Council expelled them both, and in September Münzer began a missionary tour through southwestern Germany.

Its effects were probably much slighter than has usually been supposed, for the revolt in Stühlingen had begun before Münzer started, and his extreme views were not adopted anywhere except at Muhlhausen and in its vicinity. He returned thither about February, 1525, and by March 17 he and Pfeiffer had overthrown the Council and established a communistic theocracy, an experiment which allured the peasantry of the adjacent districts into attempts at imitation. Even Erfurt was for

a time in the hands of insurgents, and the Counts of Hohenstein were forced to join their ranks. Münzer failed, however, to raise the people of Mansfeld, and there was considerable friction between him and Pfeiffer, whose objects seem to have been confined to consolidating the power of the gilds within the walls of Mühlhausen. Münzer's strength lay in the peasants outside, and, when Philip of Hesse with the Dukes of Brunswick and Saxony advanced to crush the revolt, he established his camp at Frankenhausen, some miles from Mühlhausen, while Pfeiffer remained within the city.

Divisions were also rife in the other insurgent bands; the more statesmanlike of the leaders endeavoured to restrain the peasants' excesses and to secure co-operation from other classes, while the extremists, either following the bent of their nature or deliberately counting on the effects of terror, had recourse to violent measures. The worst of their deeds was the "massacre of Weinsberg," which took place on April 17, and for which the ruffian Jäcklein Rohrbach was mainly responsible. In an attempt to join hands with the Swabian peasants, a contingent of the Franconian army commanded by Metzler attacked Weinsberg, a town not far from Heilbronn held by Count Ludwig von Helfenstein. Helfenstein had distinguished himself by his defence of Stuttgart against Duke Ulrich of Württemberg, and by his rigorous measures against such rebels as fell into his power. When a handful of peasants appeared before Weinsberg and demanded admission the Count made a sortie and cut them all down. This roused their comrades to fury; Weinsberg was stormed by Rohrbach, and no quarter was given until Metzler arrived on the scene and stopped the slaughter. He granted Rohrbach, however, custody of the prisoners, consisting of Helfenstein and seventeen other knights; and, against Metzler's orders and without his knowledge, the Count and his fellow-prisoners were early next morning made to run the gauntlet of peasants' daggers before the eyes of the Countess, a natural daughter of the Emperor Maximilian.

These bloody reprisals were not typical of the revolt; they were the work of an extreme section led by a man who was little better than a criminal, and they were generally repudiated by the other insurgent bands. The Württemberg peasants under Feuerbacher disclaimed all connexion with the "Weinsbergers," as the perpetrators of the massacre came to be called, and the deed hastened, if it did not cause, a division among the revolutionary ranks. Gotz von Berlichingen, Wendel Hipler, and Metzler, all men of comparative moderation, were chosen leaders of the insurgents from the Odenwald and the surrounding districts; and they endeavoured on the one hand to introduce more discipline among the peasants and on the other to moderate their demands. It was proposed that the Twelve Articles should be reduced to a declaration that the peasants would be satisfied with the immediate abolition of serfdom, of the lesser tithes, and of death-dues, and would

concede the performance of other services pending a definite settlement which was to be reached at a congress at Heilbronn. By these concessions and the proposal that temporal Princes should be compensated out of the wealth of the clergy for their loss of feudal dues, Hipler and Weigant hoped to conciliate some at least of the Princes; and it was probably with this end in view that the main attack of the rebels was directed against the Bishop of Wurzburg.

A violent opposition to these suggestions was offered by the extremists; their supporters were threatened with death, and Feuerbacher was deposed from the command of the Württemberg contingent. A like difficulty was experienced in the effort to induce military subordination. Believers in the equality of men held it as an axiom that no one was better than another, and they demanded that no military measures should be taken without the previous consent of the whole force. Rohrbach and his friends separated from the main body probably on account of the selection of Berlichingen as commander and of the moderate proposals of Hipler, and pursued an independent career of useless pillage. But while this violence disgusted many sympathisers with the movement, its immediate effect was to terrorise the Franconian nobles. Scores of them joined the Evangelical Brotherhood, and handed over their artillery and munitions of war. Count William of Henneberg followed their example, and the Abbots of Hersfeld and Fulda, the Bishops of Bamberg and Speier, the coadjutor of the Bishop of Wurzburg, and Margrave Casimir of Brandenburg were compelled to sign the modified Twelve Articles, or to make similar concessions

Nearly the whole of Franconia was now in the rebels' hands, and towards the end of April they began to concentrate on Wurzburg, whose Bishop was also Duke of Franconia and the most powerful Prince in the circle. The city offered little resistance, and the Bishop fled to his castle on the neighbouring Frauenberg. This was an almost impregnable fortress; and the attempt to capture it locked up the greatest mass of the peasants' forces during the crucial month of the revolution. It might have been taken or induced to surrender but for defects in the organisation of the besieging army. There was little subordination to the leaders or unity in their councils. Some were in favour of offering terms, but Geyer opposed so lukewarm a measure. The peasants obtained a fresh accession of strength by the formal entry of Rothenburg into the Evangelical Brotherhood on May 14, but on the following night, during the absence of their ablest commanders, the besiegers made an attempt to storm the castle which was repulsed with considerable loss.

Irretrievable disasters were meanwhile overtaking the peasants in other quarters of Germany. On the day after the failure to storm the Frauenberg was fought the battle of Frankenhausen, which put an end to the revolt in Thuringia. The dominions of Philip of Hesse had been less affected by the movement than those of his neighbours, mainly

because his government had been less oppressive; and, though there were disturbances, his readiness to make concessions soon pacified them, and he was able to come to the assistance of less fortunate Princes. Joining forces with the Dukes of Brunswick and Duke John of Saxony, who succeeded his brother Frederick as Elector of Saxony on May 5, Philip attacked Münzer at Frankenhausen on the 15th. According to Melanchthon, whose diatribe against Münzer has been usually accepted as the chief authority for the battle, the prophet guaranteed his followers immunity from the enemy's bullets, and they stood still singing hymns as the Princes' onslaught commenced. But their inaction seems also to have been due in part at least to the agitation of some of the insurgents for surrender. In any case there was scarcely a show of resistance; a brief cannonade demolished the line of waggons which they had, after the fashion of the Hussites, drawn up for their defence, and a few minutes later the whole force was in flight. Munzer himself was captured, and after torture and imprisonment wrote a letter, the genuineness of which has been doubted, admitting his errors and the justice of his condemnation to death. Pfeiffer and his party in Muhlhausen were now helpless, and their appeals to the Franconian insurgents, which fell upon deaf ears, would in any case have been unavailing. On the 24th Pfeiffer escaped from the city, which thereupon surrendered: he was overtaken near Eisenach, and met his inevitable fate with more courage than Munzer had shown. A like measure was meted out to the Burgomaster, Muhlhausen itself was deprived of its privileges as a free imperial city, and the revolt was easily suppressed at Erfurt and in other Thuringian districts.

The peasants had been crushed in the North, and they fared as ill in the South. Truchsess, after his truce with the Donauried, the Allgau, and the Lake contingents, had turned in the last week in April against the Black Forest bands, when he was ordered by the Swabian League to march to the relief of Württemberg, and so prevent a junction between the Franconian and Swabian rebels. On May 12 he came upon the peasants strongly entrenched on marshy ground near Boblingen. By means of an understanding with some of the leading burghers the gates of the town were opened, and Truchsess was enabled to plant artillery on the castle walls, whence it commanded the peasants' entrenchments. Compelled thus to come out into the open, they were cut to pieces by cavalry, though, with a courage which the peasants had not hitherto displayed, the Württemberg band prolonged its resistance for nearly four hours. Weinsberg next fell into Truchsess' hands and was burned to the ground, and Rohrbach was slowly roasted to death.

Truchsess' approach spread consternation in the camp at Würzburg. After the failure to storm the Frauenberg, Götz von Berlichingen deserted the peasants' cause, and about a fourth of his men returned to their homes. The remainder were detached from the camp at Wurzburg

to intercept Truchsess; they met him on June 2 at Königshofen and suffered a defeat almost as disastrous as that at Böblingen. Truchsess next fell upon Florian Geyer and his "Black Band," who made a stubborn defence at Ingolstadt, but were outnumbered and most of them slain. Geyer escaped for the time, but met his death by fair means or foul shortly afterwards at the hands of Wilhelm von Grumbach. Truchsess could now march on Wurzburg without fear of molestation; the outskirts were reached on June 5, and the leaders of the old city Council entered into communication with the approaching enemy. They conceded practically all the reactionary demands, but represented to the citizens that they had made the best terms they could; and on June 8 Truchsess and the Princes rode into the city without opposition.

The surrender of Würzburg carried with it the relief of the hard-pressed castle of Frauenberg, and, the neck of the rebellion being thus broken, its life in other parts gradually flickered out. Rothenburg was captured by Margrave Casimir on June 28, but Carlstadt and several other revolutionary leaders escaped. Memmingen was taken by stratagem, and few of the cities showed any disposition to resist. The movement in Elsass had been suppressed by Duke Anthony of Lorraine with the help of foreign mercenaries before the end of May, and by July the only districts in which large forces of the peasants remained in arms were the Allgau, Salzburg, and Ferdinand's duchies. Truchsess, having crushed the revolt in Franconia, returned to complete the work which had been interrupted in Upper Swabia. With the aid of George von Frundsberg, who had returned from Italy, and by means of treachery in the peasants' ranks, he dispersed two of the Allgau bands on July 22, and compelled a third to surrender on the banks of the Luibas. A week before Count Felix von Werdenberg had defeated the Hegau contingent at Hilzingen, relieved Radolfzell, and beheaded Hans Müller of Bulgenbach.

In the Austrian territories and in Salzburg, however, the revolution continued active throughout the winter and following spring. Waldshut, which had risen against Ferdinand's religious persecution before the outbreak of the Peasants' War, held out until December 12, 1525. The revolt in Salzburg was indirectly encouraged by the jealousy existing between its Archbishop and the Dukes of Bavaria, and by a scheme which Ferdinand entertained of dividing the archbishop's lands between the two Dukes and himself. The Archduke had in June, 1525, temporarily pacified the Tyrolese peasantry by promising a complete amnesty and granting some substantial redress of their agrarian, and even of their ecclesiastical, grievances. But Michael Gaismayr and others, who aimed at a political revolution, were not satisfied, and Gaismayr fled to Switzerland, where he received promises of support from Francis I and other enemies of the Habsburgs. Early in 1526 he returned to the attack and in May laid siege to Radstadt. At Schladming, some fifteen miles to the east of Radstadt, the peasants defeated Dietrichstein and

for some months defied the Austrian government. Gaismayr inflicted two reverses upon the forces sent to relieve Radstadt, but was unable permanently to resist the increasing contingents despatched against him by the Swabian League and the Austrian government. In July he was compelled to raise the siege, and fled to Italy, where he was murdered in 1528 by two Spaniards, who received for their deed the price put by the government on Gaismayr's head.

The Austrian duchies were one of the few districts in which the revolt resulted in an amelioration of the lot of the peasants. Margrave Philip of Baden, whose humanity was recognised on all sides, pursued a similar policy, and the Landgrave of Hesse also made some concessions. But as a rule the suppression of the movement was marked by appalling atrocities. On May 27 Leonard von Eck, the Bavarian chancellor, reports that Duke Anthony of Lorraine alone had already destroyed twenty thousand peasants in Elsass; and for the whole of Germany a moderate estimate puts the number of victims at a hundred thousand. The only consideration that restrained the victors appears to have been the fear that, unless they held their hand, they would have no one left to render them service. "If all the peasants are killed," wrote Margrave George to his brother Casimir, "where shall we get other peasants to make provision for us?" Casimir stood in need of the exhortation; at Kitzingen, near Würzburg, he put out the eyes of fifty-nine townsfolk, and forbad the rest under severe penalties to offer them medical or other assistance. When the massacre of eighteen knights at Weinsberg is adduced as proof that the peasants were savages, one may well ask what stage of civilisation had been reached by German Princes.

The effects of this failure to deal with the peasants' grievances except by methods of brutal oppression cannot be estimated with any exactitude; but its effects were no doubt enduring and disastrous. The Diet of Augsburg in 1525 attempted to mitigate the ferocity of the lords towards their subjects, but the effort did not produce much result, and to the end of the eighteenth century the German peasantry remained the most wretched in Europe. Serfdom lingered there longer than in any other civilised country save Russia, and the mass of the people were effectively shut out from the sphere of political action. The beginnings of democracy were crushed in the cities; the knights and then the peasants were beaten down. And only the territorial power of the Princes profited. The misery of the mass of her people must be reckoned as one of the causes of the national weakness and intellectual sterility which marked Germany during the latter part of the sixteenth century. The religious lead which she had given to Europe passed into other hands, and the literary awakening which preceded and accompanied the Reformation was followed by slumbers at least as profound as those which had gone before.

The difficulty of assigning reasons for the failure of the revolt itself

is enhanced by that of determining how far it was really a revolutionary movement and how far reactionary. Was it the last and greatest of the medieval peasant revolts, or was it a premature birth of modern democracy? It was probably a combination of both. The hardships of the peasants and town proletariate were undoubtedly aggravated by the economic revolution, the substitution of a world-market for local markets, the consequent growth of capitalism and of the relative poverty of the poorest classes; and, in so far as they saw no remedy except in a return to the worn-out medieval system, their objects were reactionary, and would have failed ultimately, even if they had achieved a temporary success. On the other hand, the ideas which their leaders developed during the course of the movement, such as the abolition of serfdom, the participation of peasants in politics, the universal application of the principle of election, were undeniably revolutionary and premature. Many of these ideas have been since successfully put into practice, but in 1525 the classes which formulated them had not acquired the faculties necessary for the proper exercise of political power; and the movement was an abortion.

The effect of its suppression upon the religious development of Germany was none the less disastrous. In its religious aspect the Peasants' Revolt was an appeal of the poor and oppressed to "divine justice" against the oppressor. They had eagerly applied to their lords the biblical anathemas against the rich, and interpreted the beatitudes as a promise of redress for the wrongs of the poor. They were naturally unconvinced by Luther's declarations that the Gospel only guaranteed a spiritual and not a temporal emancipation, and that spiritual liberty was the only kind of freedom to which they had a right. They felt that such a doctrine might suit Luther and his knightly and *bourgeois* supporters, who already enjoyed an excessive temporal franchise, but that in certain depths of material misery the cultivation of spiritual and moral welfare was impossible. It was a counsel of perfection to advise them to be content with spiritual solace when they complained that they could not feed their bodies. They did not regard poverty as compatible with the "divine justice" to which they appealed; and when their appeal was met by the slaughter of a hundred thousand of their numbers their faith in the new Gospel received a fatal blow. Their aspirations, which had been so vividly expressed in the popular literature of the last five years, were turned into despair, and they relapsed into a state of mind which was not far removed from materialistic atheism. Who knows, they asked, what God is, or whether there is a God? And the minor questions at issue between Luther and the Pope they viewed with profound indifference.

Such was the result of the Peasants' Revolt and of Luther's intervention. His conduct will always remain a matter of controversy, because its interpretation depends not so much upon what he said or

left unsaid, as upon the respective emphasis to be laid on the various things he said, and on the meaning his words were likely to convey to his readers. His first tract on the subject, written and published in the early days of the movement, distributed blame with an impartial but lavish hand. He could not countenance the use of force, but many of the peasants' demands were undeniably just, and their revolt was the vengeance of God for the Princes' sins. Both parties could, and no doubt did, interpret this as a pronouncement in their favour; and, indeed, stripped of its theology, violence, and rhetoric, the tract was a sensible and accurate diagnosis of the case. But, although the Princes may have deserved his strictures, a prudent man who really believed the revolt to be evil would have refrained from such attacks at that moment. Luther, however, could not resist the temptation to attribute the ruin which threatened the Princes to their stiffnecked rejection of Lutheran dogma; and his invectives poured oil on the flames of revolt. Its rapid progress filled him with genuine terror, and it is probably unjust to ascribe his second tract merely to a desire to be found on the side of the big battalions. It appeared in the middle of May, 1525, possibly before the news of any great defeat inflicted on the insurgent bands had reached him, and when it would have required more than Luther's foresight to predict their speedy collapse.

Yet terror and his proximity to Thuringia, the scene of the most violent and dangerous form of the revolt, while they may palliate, cannot excuse Luther's efforts to rival the brutal ferocity of Münzer's doctrines. He must have known that the Princes' victory, if it came at all, would be bloody enough without his exhortations to kill and slay the peasants like mad dogs, and without his promise of heaven to those who fell in the holy work. His sympathy with the masses seems to have been limited to those occasions when he saw in them a useful weapon to hold over the heads of his enemies. He once lamented that refractory servants could no longer be treated like "other cattle" as in the days of the Patriarchs; and he joined with Melanchthon and Spalatin in removing the scruples of a Saxon noble with regard to the burdens his tenants bore. "The ass *will* have blows," he said, "and the people *will* be ruled by force"; and he was not free from the upstart's contempt for the class from which he sprang.* His followers echoed his sentiments; Melanchthon thought even serfdom too mild for stubborn folk like the Germans, and maintained that the master's right of punishment and the servant's duty of submission should both be unlimited. It was little wonder that the organisers of the Lutheran Church afterwards found the peasants deaf to their exhortations, or that Melanchthon was once constrained to admit that the people abhorred himself and his fellow-divines.

It is almost a commonplace with Lutheran writers to justify Luther's action on the ground that the Peasants' Revolt was revolutionary,

unlawful, immoral, while the religious movement was reforming, lawful, and moral; but the hard and fast line which is thus drawn vanishes on a closer investigation. The peasants had no constitutional means wherewith to attain their ends, and there is no reason to suppose that they would have resorted to force unless force had been prepared to resist them; if, as Luther maintained, it was the Christian's duty to tolerate worldly ills, it was incumbent on Christian Princes as well as on Christian peasants; and if, as he said, the Peasants' Revolt was a punishment divinely ordained for the Princes, what right had they to resist? Moreover, the Lutherans themselves were only content with constitutional means so long as they proved successful; when they failed Lutherans also resorted to arms against their lawful Emperor. Nor was there anything in the peasants' demands more essentially revolutionary than the repudiation of the Pope's authority and the wholesale appropriation of ecclesiastical property. The distinction between the two movements has for its basis the fact that the one was successful, the other was not; while the Peasants' Revolt failed, the Reformation triumphed, and then discarded its revolutionary guise and assumed the respectable garb of law and order.

Luther in fact saved the Reformation by cutting it adrift from the failing cause of the peasants and tying it to the chariot wheels of the triumphant Princes. If he had not been the apostle of revolution, he had at least commanded the army in which all the revolutionaries fought. He had now repudiated his left wing and was forced to depend on his right. The movement from 1521 to 1525 had been national, and Luther had been its hero; from the position of national hero he now sank to be the prophet of a sect, and a sect which depended for existence upon the support of political powers. Melanchthon admitted that the decrees of the Lutheran Church were merely platonic conclusions without the support of the Princes, and Luther suddenly abandoned his views on the freedom of conscience and the independence of the Church. In 1523 he had proclaimed the duty of obeying God before men; at the end of 1524 he was invoking the secular arm against the remnant of papists at Wittenberg; it was to punish the ungodly, he said, that the sword had been placed in the hands of authority, and it was in vain that the Elector Frederick reminded him of his previous teaching, that men should let only the Word fight for them. Separated from the Western Church and alienated from the bulk of the German people, Lutheran divines leant upon territorial Princes, and repaid their support with undue servility; even Henry VIII extorted from his bishops no more degrading compliance than the condoning by Melanchthon and others of Philip of Hesse's bigamy. Melanchthon came to regard the commands of princes as the ordinances of God, while Luther looked upon them as Bishops of the Church, and has been classed by Treitschke with Machiavelli as a champion of the indefeasible rights of the State.

Erastus, like most political philosophers, only reduced to theory what had long been the practice of Princes.

This alliance of Lutheran State and Lutheran Church was based on mutual interest. Some of the peasant leaders had offered the Princes compensation for the loss of their feudal dues out of the revenues of the Church. The Lutherans offered them both, they favoured the retention of feudal dues and the confiscation of ecclesiastical property; and the latter could only be satisfactorily effected through the intervention of the territorial principle, for neither religious party would have tolerated the acquisition by the Emperor of the ecclesiastical territories within the Empire. Apart from the alleged evils inherent in the wealth of the clergy, secularisation of Church property was recommended on the ground that many of the duties attached to it had already passed to some extent under State or municipal supervision, such as the regulation of poor relief and of education; and the history of the fifteenth century had shown that the defence of Christendom depended solely upon the exertions of individual States, and that the Church could no longer, as in the days of the Crusades, excite any independent enthusiasm against the infidel. It was on the plea of the necessities of this defence that Catholic as well as Lutheran princes made large demands upon ecclesiastical revenues. With the diminution of clerical goods went a decline in the independence of the clergy and a corresponding increase in the authority of territorial Princes; and it was by the prospect of reducing his Bishops and priests to subjection that sovereigns like Margrave Casimir of Brandenburg were induced to adopt the Lutheran cause.

The Lutherans had need of every recruit, for the reaction which crushed the peasants threatened to involve them in a similar ruin. Duke Anthony of Lorraine regarded the suppression of the revolt in the light of a crusade against Luther, and many a Gospel preacher was summarily executed on a charge of sedition for which there was slender ground. Catholic Princes felt that they would never be secure against a recurrence of rebellion until they had extirpated the root of the evil; and the embers of social strife were scarcely stamped out when they began to discuss schemes for extinguishing heresy. In July, 1525, Duke George of Saxony, who may have entertained hopes of seizing his cousin's electorate, the Electors Joachim of Brandenburg and Albrecht of Mainz, Duke Henry of Brunswick-Wolfenbuttel, and other Catholic Princes met at Dessau to consider a Catholic League, and Henry of Brunswick was sent to Charles to obtain the imperial support. The danger produced a like combination of Lutherans, and in October, 1525, Philip of Hesse proposed a defensive alliance between himself and Elector John at Torgau; it was completed at Gotha in the following March, and at Magdeburg it was joined by that city, the Brunswick-Luneburg Dukes, Otto, Ernest, and Francis, Duke Philip of Brunswick-Grubenhagen,

Duke Henry of Mecklenburg, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt-Köthen, and Counts Gebhard and Albrecht of Mansfeld.

This league was the work of Philip of Hesse, the statesman to whom the Reformation in Germany largely owed its success; his genuine adoption of its doctrines had little effect on his personal morality, yet he risked his all in the cause and devoted to it abilities of a very high order. But for his slender means and narrow domains he might have played a great part in history; as it was, his courage, fertility of resource, wide outlook, and independence of formulas enabled him to exert a powerful influence on the fortunes of his creed and his country. He already meditated a scheme, which he afterwards carried into effect, of restoring Duke Ulrich of Württemberg; and the skill with which he played on Bavarian jealousy of the Habsburgs more than once saved the Reformers from a Catholic combination. He wished to include in the league the half-Zwinglian cities of South Germany, and although his far-reaching scheme for a union between Zwinglian Switzerland and Lutheran Germany was baulked by Luther's obstinacy and Zwingli's defeat at Kappel, he looked as early as 1526 for help to the Northern Powers which eventually saved the Reformation in the course of the Thirty Years' War.

Meanwhile a Diet summoned to meet at Augsburg in December, 1525, was scantily attended and proved abortive. Another met at Speier in the following June, and its conduct induced a Reformer to describe it as the boldest and freest Diet that ever assembled. The old complaints against Rome were revived, and the recent revolt was attributed to clerical abuses. A committee of Princes reported in favour of the marriage of priests, communion in both kinds, the abolition of private masses, a reduction in the number of fasts, the joint use of Latin and German in baptismal services and in the celebration of the Eucharist, and the interpretation of Scripture by Scripture. To prevent the adoption of these resolutions Ferdinand produced instructions from the Emperor, dated the 23rd of March, 1526, in which he forbade innovations, promised to discuss the question of a General Council with the Pope, and demanded the execution of the Edict of Worms. The cities, however, again declared the last to be impracticable, and called attention to the fact that, whereas at the date of Charles' letter he had been at peace with the Pope, they were now at open enmity. They declined to believe that the Emperor's intentions remained the same under these altered conditions; and they proposed sending a deputation to Spain to demand the suspension of the Edict of Worms, and the immediate convocation of a General or at least a National Council. Meanwhile the Princes suggested that as regarded matters of faith each Prince should so conduct himself as he could answer for his behaviour to God and to the Emperor; and this proposal was adopted, was promulgated in the Diet's Recess, and thus became the law of the Empire. Both the Emperor and

the national government seemed to have abdicated their control over ecclesiastical policy in favour of the territorial Princes; and the separatist principle, which had long dominated secular politics, appeared to have legally established itself within the domain of religion.

The Diet had presumed too much upon Charles' hostility to the Pope, but there were grounds for this assumption. Although his letter arrived too late to affect the Diet's decision, the Emperor had actually written on July 27, suggesting the abolition of the penal clauses in the Edict of Worms, and the submission of evangelical doctrines to the consideration of a General Council. But this change of attitude was entirely due to the momentary exigencies of his foreign relations. Clement VII was hand in glove with the League of Cognac, formed to wrest from Charles the fruits of Pavia. The Emperor, threatened with excommunication, replied by remarking that Luther might be made a man of importance; while Charles' lieutenant, Moncada, captured the castle of St Angelo, and told the Pope that God himself could not withstand the victorious imperial arms. Other Spaniards were urging Charles to abolish the temporal power of the Papacy, as the root of all the Italian wars; and he hoped to find in the Lutherans a weapon against the Pope, a hope which was signally fulfilled when Frundsberg led eleven thousand troops, four thousand of whom served without pay, to the sack of Rome.

Moreover Ferdinand was in no position to coerce the Lutheran princes. The peasant revolts in his Austrian duchies were not yet subdued, and he was toying with the idea of an extensive secularisation of ecclesiastical property. He had seized the bishopric of Brixen, meditated a partition of Salzburg, and told his Estates at Innsbruck that the common people objected altogether to the exercise of clerical jurisdiction in temporal concerns. And before long considerations of the utmost importance for the future of his House and of Europe further diverted his energies from the prosecution of either religious or political objects in Germany; for 1526 was the birth-year of the Austro-Hungarian State which now holds in its straining bond all that remains of Habsburg power.

The ruin which overtook the kingdom of Hungary at Mohács (August 30, 1526) has been ascribed to various causes. The simplest is that Hungary, and no other State, barred the path of the Turks, and felt the full force of their onslaught at a time when the Ottoman Power was in the first flush of its vigour, and was wielded by perhaps the greatest of Sultans. Hungary, though divided, was at least as united as Germany or Italy; it was to some extent isolated from the rest of Europe, but it effected no such breach with Western Christendom as Bohemia had done in the Hussite wars, and Bohemia escaped the heel of the Turk. The foreign policy of Hungary was ill-directed and inconsequent; but if the marriage of its King with the Emperor's sister and that of its Princess

with his brother could not protect it, the weaving of diplomatic webs would not have impeded the Turkish advance. No Hungarian wizard could have revived the Crusades; and Hungary fell a victim not so much to faults of her own, as to the misfortune of her geographical position, and to the absorption of Christian Europe in its internecine warfare.

But Hungary's necessity was the Habsburgs' opportunity. For at least a century that ambitious race had dreamt of the union of Austria, Bohemia, and Hungary under its sway. Under Albrecht II and his son Wladislav the dream enjoyed a twenty years' realisation (1437–57); but after the latter's death Bohemia found a national King in Podiebrad and Hungary in Corvinus. On the extinction of these two lines the realms were again united, but not under Austrian rule; and for more than a generation two Polish princes of the House of Jagello successively sat on the Cech and Magyar thrones. The Emperor Maximilian, however, never ceased to grasp at the chance which his feeble father had missed; and before his death two of his grandchildren were betrothed to Louis II and his sister Anna, while the Austrian succession, in default of issue to Louis, was secured by solemn engagements on the part of both the kingdoms.

The death of Louis at Mohács hastened the crucial hour. Both kingdoms prided themselves on their independence and right to elect their monarchs, and in both there was national antagonism to German encroachment. In Hungary, where the Reformation had made some slight progress, the Catholic national party was led by John Zapolya, who had earned a reputation by his cruel suppression of a Hungarian peasant revolt in 1514, and had eagerly sought the hand of the Princess Anna. His object throughout had been the throne, and the marriage of Anna to Ferdinand enraged him to such an extent that he stood idly by while the Turk triumphed over his country at Mohács. He would rather be King by the grace of Solyman than see Hungary free under Ferdinand. The nobles' hatred of German rule came to Zapolya's aid, and on November 10, 1526, disregarding alike Ferdinand's claims through his wife and their previous treaty-engagements, they chose Zapolya King at Stuhlweissenburg, and crowned him the following day.

Had Ferdinand had only one rival to fear in Bohemia the result might have been similar, but a multitude of candidates divided the opposition. Sigismund of Poland, Joachim of Brandenburg, Albrecht of Prussia, three Saxon Princes, and two Bavarian Dukes, all thought of entering the lists, but Ferdinand's most serious competitors were his Wittelsbach rivals, who had long intrigued for the Bohemian throne. But if the Cechs were to elect a German King, a Wittelsbach possessed no advantages over a Habsburg, and Ferdinand carried the day at Prague on October 23, 1526. The theory that he owed his success to a Catholicism which was moderate compared with that of the Bavarian Dukes ignores the Catholic reaction which had followed the Hussite movement; and the Articles

submitted to Ferdinand by his future subjects expressly demanded the prohibition of clerical marriages, the maintenance of fasts, and the veneration of Saints Of course, like his predecessors, he had to sign the *compactata* extorted by the Bohemians from the Council of Basel and still unconfirmed by the Pope, but this was no great concession to heresy, and Ferdinand showed much firmness in refusing stipulations which would have weakened his royal authority. In spite of the hopes which his adversaries built on this attitude he was crowned with acclamation at Prague on February 24, 1527, the anniversary of Pavia and of Charles V's birth.

He then turned his attention to Hungary; his widowed sister's exertions had resulted in an assemblage of nobles which elected Ferdinand King at Pressburg on December 17, 1526; and the efforts of Francis I and the Pope, of England and Venice, to strengthen Zapolya's party proved vain. During the following summer Ferdinand was recognised as King by another Diet at Buda, defeated Zapolya at Tokay, and on November 3 was crowned at Stuhlweissenburg, the scene of his rival's election in the previous year. This rapid success led him to indulge in dreams which later Habsburgs succeeded in fulfilling. Besides the prospect of election as King of the Romans, he hoped to secure the duchy of Milan and to regain for Hungary its lost province of Bosnia. Ferdinand might almost be thought to have foreseen the future importance of the events of 1526-7, and the part which his conglomerate kingdom was to play in the history of Europe.

These diversions of Ferdinand, and the absorption of Charles V in his wars in Italy and with England and France, afforded the Lutherans an opportunity of turning the Recess of Speier to an account which the Habsburgs and the Catholic Princes had certainly never contemplated. In their anxiety to discover a constitutional and legal plea which should remove from the Reformation the reproach of being a revolution, Lutheran historians have attempted to differentiate this Recess from other laws of the Empire, and to regard it rather as a treaty between two independent Powers, which neither could break without the other's consent, than as a law which might be repealed by a simple majority of the Estates. It was represented as a fundamental part of the constitution beyond the reach of ordinary constitutional weapons; and the neglect of the Emperor and the Catholic majority to adopt this view is urged as a legal justification of that final resort to arms, on the successful issue of which the existence of Protestantism within the Empire was really based.

It is safe to affirm that no such idea had occurred to the majority of the Diet which passed the Recess. The Emperor and the Catholic Princes had admitted the inexpediency and impracticability of reducing Germany at that juncture to religious conformity; but they had by no means forsworn an attempt in the future when circumstances might

prove more propitious. Low as the central authority had fallen before the onslaughts of territorial separatists, it was not yet prepared to admit that the question of the nation's religion had for ever escaped its control. But for the moment it was compelled to look on while individual Princes organised Churches at will; and the majority had to content themselves with replying to Lutheran expulsion of Catholic doctrine by enforcing it still more rigorously in their several spheres of influence.

The right to make ecclesiastical ordinances, which the Empire had exercised at Worms in 1521 and at Nürnberg in 1523 and 1524, but had temporarily abandoned at Speier, was not restored to the Church, but passed to the territorial Princes, in whose hostility to clerical privileges and property Luther found his most effective support. Hence the democratic form of Church government, which had been elaborated by François Lambert and adopted by a synod summoned to Homberg by Philip of Hesse in October, 1526, failed to take root in Germany It was based on the theory that every Christian participates in the priesthood, that the Church consists only of the faithful, and that each religious community should have complete independence and full powers of ecclesiastical discipline. It was on similar lines that "Free" Churches were subsequently developed in Scotland, England, France, and America. But such ideas were alien to the absolute monarchic principle with which Luther had cast in his lot, and the German Reformers, like the Anglican, preferred a Church in which the sovereign and not the congregation was the *summus episcopus.* In his hands were vested the powers of punishment for religious opinion, and in Germany as in England religious persecutions were organised by the State. It was perhaps as well that the State and not the Lutheran Church exercised coercive functions, for the rigour applied by Lutheran Princes to dissident Catholics fell short of Luther's terrible imprecations, and of the cruelties inflicted on heretics in orthodox territories.

The breach between the Lutheran Church and the Church of Rome was, with regard to both ritual and doctrine, slight compared with that effected by Zwingli or Calvin. Latin Christianity was the groundwork of the Lutheran Church, and its divines sought only to repair the old foundation and not to lay down a new. Luther would tolerate no figurative interpretation of the words of institution of the Eucharist, and he stoutly maintained the doctrine of a real presence, in his own sense. With the exception of the "abominable canon," which implied a sacrifice, the Catholic Mass was retained in the Lutheran Service; and on this question every attempt at union with the "Reformed" Churches broke down. The changes introduced during the ecclesiastical visitations of Lutheran Germany in 1526-7 were at least as much concessions to secular dislike of clerical privilege as to religious antipathy to Catholic doctrine. The abolition of episcopal jurisdiction increased the independence of parish priests, but it enhanced even more the princely

authority. The confiscation of monastic property enriched parish churches and schools, and in Hesse facilitated the foundation of the University of Marburg, but it also swelled the State exchequer; and the marriage of priests tended to destroy their privileges as a caste and merge them in the mass of their fellow-citizens.

It was not these questions of ecclesiastical government or ritual which evoked enthusiasm for the Lutheran cause. Its strength lay in its appeal to the conscience, in its emancipation of the individual from the restrictions of an ancient but somewhat oppressive system, in its declaration that the means of salvation were open to all, and that neither priest nor Pope could take them away; that individual faith was sufficient and the whole apparatus of clerical mediation cumbrous and nugatory. The absolute, immediate dependence on God, on which Luther insisted so strongly, excluded dependence on man; and the individualistic egotism and quickening conscience of the age were alike exalted by the sense of a new-born spiritual liberty. To this moral elation Luther's hymns contributed as much as his translation of the New Testament, and his musical ear made them national songs. The first collection was published in 1524, and Luther's *Ein feste Burg ist unser Gott*, written in 1527, has been described by Heine as the *Marseillaise* of the Reformation; it was equally popular as a song of triumph in the hour of victory and as a solace in persecution. Luther was still at work on his translation of the Bible, and his third great literary contribution to the edification of the Lutheran Church was his *Catechism*, which appeared in a longer and a shorter form (1529), and in the latter became the norm for German Churches. The way for it had been prepared by two of Luther's disciples, Johann Agricola and Justus Jonas; and other colleagues in the organisation of the Lutheran Church were Amsdorf, Luther's Elisha, Melanchthon, whose theological learning, intellectual acuteness, and forbearance towards the Catholics, were marred by a lack of moral strength, and Bugenhagen. The practical genius of the last-named reformer was responsible for the evangelisation of the greater part of North Germany, which, with the exception of the territories of the Elector of Brandenburg, of Duke George of Saxony, and of Duke Henry of Brunswick-Wolfenbuttel, had by 1529 broken away from the Catholic Church.

But the respite afforded by the Diet of Speier, invaluable though it proved, was not of long duration, and the Lutheran Princes were soon threatened with attacks from their fellow-Princes and from the Emperor himself. A meeting between Elector Joachim of Brandenburg, Duke George of Saxony, and the Archduke Ferdinand, now King of Hungary and Bohemia, at Breslau in May, 1527, gave rise to rumours of a Catholic conspiracy; and these suspicions, to which the Landgrave's hasty temperament led him to attach too ready a credence, were turned to account by one Otto von Pack, who had acted as Vice-Chancellor of

ke George of Saxony. Pack forged a document purporting to be an :hentic copy of an offensive league between Ferdinand, the Electors of ıinz and Brandenburg, Duke George of Saxony, the Dukes of Bavaria, l the Bishops of Salzburg, Wurzburg, and Bamberg, the object of ich was first to drive Zapolya from Hungary, and then to make war the Elector of Saxony unless he surrendered Luther For this ırmation the Landgrave paid Pack four thousand crowns, and patched him to Hungary to warn Zapolya and to concert measures lefence. Another envoy was sent to Francis I; and at Weimar in ·ch, 1528, Philip concluded a treaty with the Elector of Saxony in :h they agreed to anticipate the attack. The Landgrave at once ın to mobilise his forces, but Luther persuaded the Elector to halt. the parties concerned denied the alleged conspiracy, and eventually p himself admitted that he had been deceived. Illogically, however, emanded that the Bishops should pay the cost of his mobilisation; as they had no force wherewith to resist, they were compelled to find ndred thousand crowns between them.

The violence of this proceeding naturally embittered the Catholics, Philip was charged with having concocted the whole plot and gated Pack's forgeries. These accusations have been satisfactorily oved, but the Landgrave's conduct must be held partially re-sible for the increased persecution of Lutherans which followed in , and for the hostile attitude of the Diet of Speier in 1529. The olic States began to organise visitations for the extirpation of y; in Austria printers and vendors of heretical books were con-ıed to be drowned as poisoners of the minds of the people. In ria in 1528 thirty-eight persons were burnt or drowned, and the ns included men of distinction such as Leonhard Käser, Heuglin, f Clarenbach, and Peter Flysteden, while the historian Aventinus ·ed prolonged imprisonment. In Brandenburg the most illustrious n was the Elector's wife, the Danish Princess Elizabeth, who only ıed death or lifelong incarceration by flight to her cousin, the ·or of Saxony.

Meanwhile the Emperor's attitude grew ever more menacing, for a revolution had reversed the imperial policy. The idea of playing Luther against the Pope had probably never been serious, and the ests in Spain against Charles' treatment of Clement would alone convinced him of the dangers of such an adventure. Between and 1529 he gradually reached the conclusion that a Pope was pensable. Immediately after the Sack of Rome one of his agents warned him of the danger lest England and France should establish archates of their own; and a Pope of the universal Church under control of Charles as master of Italy was too useful an instrument to ghtly abandoned, if for no other reason than that an insular Pope ıgland would grant the divorce of Henry VIII from Catharine of

Aragon. The Emperor also wanted Catholic help to restore his brother-in-law, Christian II of Denmark, deposed by his Lutheran subjects; he desired papal recognition for Ferdinand's new kingdoms; and his own imperial authority in Germany could not have survived the secularisation of the ecclesiastical electorates Empire and Papacy, said Zwingli, both emanated from Rome; neither could stand if the other fell. At the same time the issue of the war in Italy in 1528–9 convinced Clement that he could not stand without Charles, and paved the way for the mutual understanding which was sealed by the Treaty of Barcelona (June 29, 1529). It was almost a family compact; the Pope's nephew was to marry the Emperor's illegitimate daughter, the Medici tyranny was to be re-established in Florence, the divorce of Catharine to be refused, the papal countenance to be withdrawn from Zapolya, and Emperor and Pope were to unite against Turks and heretics. The Treaty of Cambray (August 3) soon afterwards released Charles from his war with France and left him free for a while to turn his attention to Germany.

The growing intimacy between the Emperor and Pope had already smoothed the path of reaction, and reinforced the antagonism of the Catholic majority to the Lutheran princes. In 1528 Charles sent the Provost of Waldkirch to Germany to strengthen the Catholic cause; Duke Henry of Mecklenburg returned to the Catholic fold; the wavering Elector Palatine forbade his subjects to attend the preaching of Lutherans; and at the Diet of Speier, which met on February 21, 1529, the Evangelicals found themselves a divided and hopeless minority opposed to a determined and solid majority of Catholics. Only three of their number were chosen to sit on the committee appointed to discuss the religious question. Charles had sent instructions denouncing the Recess of 1526 and practically dictating the terms of a new one. The Catholics were not prepared to admit this reduction of the Diet to the status of a machine for registering imperial rescripts; but their modifications were intended rather to show their independence than to alter the purport of Charles' proposals, and their resolutions amounted to this: there was to be complete toleration for Catholics in Lutheran States, but no toleration for Lutherans in Catholic States, and no toleration anywhere for Zwinglians and Anabaptists; the Lutherans were to make no further innovations in their own dominions, and clerical jurisdictions and property were to be inviolate.

The differentiation between Lutherans and Zwinglians was a skilful attempt to drive a wedge between the two sections of the anti-Catholic party,—an attempt which Melanchthon's pusillanimity nearly brought to a successful issue. The Zwinglian party included the principal towns of south Germany; but Melanchthon was ready to abandon them as the price of peace for the Lutheran Church. Philip of Hesse, however, had none of the theological narrowness which characterised Luther and

Melanchthon, and, in a less degree, even Zwingli; he was not so blind as the divines to the political necessities of the situation, and he managed to avert a breach for the time; it was due to him that Strassburg and Ulm, Nürnberg and Memmingen, and other towns added their weight to the protest against the decree of the Diet. Jacob Sturm of Strassburg and Tetzel of Nürnberg were, indeed, the most zealous champions of the Recess of 1526 during the debates of the Diet; but their arguments and the mediation of moderate Catholics remained without effect upon the majority. The complaint of the Lutherans that the proposed Recess would tie their hands and open the door to Catholic reaction naturally made no impression, for such was precisely its object. The Catholics saw that their opportunity had come, and they were determined to take at its flood the tide of reaction. The plea that the unanimous decision of 1526 could not be repealed by one party, though plausible enough as logic and in harmony with the particularism of the time, rested upon the unconstitutional assumption that the parties were independent of the Empire's authority; and it was not reasonable to expect any Diet to countenance so suicidal a theory.

A revolution is necessarily weak in its legal aspect, and must depend on its moral strength; and to revolution the Lutheran Princes in spite of themselves were now brought. They were driven back on to ground on which any revolution may be based; and a secret understanding to withstand every attack made on them on account of God's Word, whether it proceeded from the Swabian League or the national government, was adopted by Electoral Saxony, Hesse, Strassburg, Ulm, and Nurnberg. We fear the Emperor's ban, wrote one of the party, but we fear still more God's curse; and God, they proclaimed, must be obeyed before man. This was an appeal to God and to conscience which transcended legal considerations. It was the very essence of the Reformation, though it was often denied by Reformers themselves; and it explains the fact that from the Protest, in which the Lutherans embodied this principle, is derived the name which, for want of a better term, is loosely applied to all the Churches which renounced the obedience of Rome

A formal Protest against the impending Recess of the Diet had been discussed at Nurnberg in March, and adopted at Speier in April. When, on the 19th, Ferdinand and the other imperial commissioners refused all concessions and confirmed the Acts of the Diet, the Protest was publicly read. The Protestants affirmed that the Diet's decree was not binding on them because they were not consenting parties; they proclaimed their intention to abide by the Recess of 1526, and so to fulfil their religious duties as they could answer for it to God and the Emperor. They demanded that their Protest should be incorporated in the Recess, and on Ferdinand's refusal, they published a few days later an appeal from the Diet to the Emperor, to the next General Council of Christendom, or to a congress of the German nation. The Princes who signed

the Protest were the Elector John of Saxony, Margrave George of Brandenburg, Dukes Ernest and Francis of Brunswick-Lüneburg, Landgrave Philip of Hesse, and Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt; and the fourteen cities which adhered to it were Strassburg, Ulm, Nürnberg, Constance, Lindau, Memmingen, Kempten, Nördlingen, Heilbronn, Reutlingen, Isny, St Gallen, Wissenberg, and Windsheim. Of such slender dimensions was the original Protestant Church; small as it was, it was only held together by the negative character of its Protest; dissensions between its two sections increased the conflict of creeds and parties which rent the whole of Germany for the following twenty-five years.

CHAPTER VII.

THE CONFLICT OF CREEDS AND PARTIES IN GERMANY.

The threats of the victorious Catholic majority at Speier and the diplomacy of Philip of Hesse had, despite the forebodings of Luther and the imprecations of Melanchthon, produced a temporary alliance between the Lutheran north and the Zwinglian south; and the summer and autumn of 1529 were spent in attempts to make the union permanent and to cement it by means of religious agreement. In the secret understanding concluded between Electoral Saxony, Hesse, Nurnberg, Ulm, and Strassburg at Speier on April 22, it was arranged that a conference should be held at Rodach, near Coburg, in the following June. But this coalition between Lutheran Princes and Zwinglian towns had been concealed from the divines, and as soon as it came to their ears they raised a vehement protest. Melanchthon lamented that his friends had not made even greater concessions at Speier; if they had only repudiated Zwingli and all his works, the Catholics, he thought, might not have hardened their hearts against Luther; and he did his best to dissuade his friends in Nürnberg from participating in the coming congress at Rodach. Luther not only denounced the idea of defending by force what Melanchthon described as "the godless opinions" of Zwingli, but denied the right of Lutherans to defend themselves. Resort to arms he considered both wicked and needless: "Be ye still," he quoted from Isaiah, "and ye shall be holpen"; and, while the conference at Rodach succumbed to his opposition, a vast army of Turks was swarming up the banks of the Danube and directing its march on Vienna. Solyman brandished the sword which Luther refused to grasp.

Hungary had failed to resist the Turks by herself; but the Austrian shield, under which she took shelter, afforded no better protection, and Ferdinand only escaped the fate of Louis II because he kept out of the way. Absorbed in the Lutheran conflict, he made no attempt to secure his conquests of 1527, and, when the Turkish invasion began, Zapolya descended from his stronghold in the Carpathians, defeated a handful of Ferdinand's friends, and surrendered the crown of St Stephen on the

scene of Mohács to the Sultan. Unresisted, the Turkish forces swept over the plains of Hungary, crossed the imperial frontier, and on September 20 planted their standards before the walls of Vienna. But over these the Crescent was never destined to wave, and the brilliant defence of Vienna in 1529 stopped the first, as a still more famous defence a hundred and fifty years later foiled the last, Turkish onslaught on Germany. The valour of the citizens, the excellence of the artillery, with which the late Emperor Maximilian had furnished the city, and the early rigour of winter supplied the defects of the Habsburg power, and on October 15 Solyman raised the siege. Ferdinand failed to make adequate use of the Sultan's retreat; lack of pay caused a mutiny of *landsknechte*; and though Gran fell into his hands he could not recapture Buda, and the greater part of Hungary remained under the nominal rule of Zapolya, but real control of the Turk.

The relief of Vienna was received with mingled feelings in Germany. Luther, who had once denied the duty of Christians to fight the infidel as involving resistance to God's ordinance, had been induced to recant by the imminence of danger and the pressure of popular feeling. In 1529 he exhorted his countrymen to withstand the Turk in language as vigorous as that in which he had urged them to crush the peasants; and the retreat of the Ottoman was generally hailed as a national deliverance. But the joy was not universal, even in Germany. Secular and religious foes of the Habsburgs had offered their aid to Zapolya; while Philip of Hesse lamented the Turkish failure and hoped for another attack. The Turk was in fact the ally of the Reformation, which might have been crushed without his assistance; and to a clear-sighted statesman like Philip no other issue than ruin seemed possible from the mutual enmity of the two Protestant Churches.

The abortive result of the meeting at Rodach in June and the abandonment of the adjourned congress at Schwabach in August only stirred the Landgrave to fresh efforts in the cause of Protestant union. On the last day in September he assembled the leading divines of the two communions at his castle of Marburg with a view to smoothing over the religious dissensions which had proved fatal to their political co-operation. The conference was not likely to fail for want of eminent disputants. The two heresiarchs themselves, Luther and Zwingli, were present, and their two chief supporters, Melanchthon and Oecolampadius. The Zwinglian cities of Germany were represented by Bucer and Hedio of Strassburg; the Lutherans by Justus Jonas and Caspar Cruciger from Wittenberg, Myconius from Gotha, Brenz from Hall, Osiander from Nurnberg, and Stephen Agricola from Augsburg. But they came in different frames of mind; Luther prophesied failure from the first, and it was with the greatest difficulty that Melanchthon could be induced even to discuss accommodation with such impious doctrines as Zwingli's. On the other hand the Zurich Reformer started with

sanguine hopes and with a predisposition to make every possible concession, in order to pave the way for the religious and political objects which he and the Landgrave cherished. But these objects were viewed with dislike and suspicion by the Lutheran delegates. Public controversy between Luther and Zwingli had already waxed fierce. Zwingli had first crossed Luther's mental horizon as the ally of Carlstadt, a sinister conjunction the effects of which were not allayed by Zwingli's later developments. The Swiss Reformer was a combination of the humanist, the theologian, and the radical; while Luther was a pure theologian. Zwingli's dogmas were softened alike by his classical sympathies and by his contact with practical government. Thus he would not deny the hope of salvation to moral teachers like Socrates; while Luther thought that the extension of the benefits of the Gospel to the heathen, who had never been taught it, deprived it of all its efficacy. The same broad humanity led Zwingli to limit the damning effects of original sin; he shrank from consigning the vast mass of mankind to eternal perdition, believed that God's grace might possibly work through more channels than the one selected by Luther, and was inclined to circumscribe that diabolic agency which played so large a part in Luther's theological system and personal experience.

Zwingli was in fact the most modern in mind of all the Reformers, while Luther was the most medieval. Luther's conception of truth was theological, and not scientific; to him it was something simple and absolute, not complex and relative. A man either had or had not the Spirit of God; there was nothing between heaven and hell. One or the other of us, he wrote with regard to Zwingli, must be the devil's minister; and the idea that both parties might have perceived some different aspect of truth was beyond his comprehension. This dilemma was his favourite dialectical device; it reduced argument to anathema and excluded from the first all chance of agreement. He applied it to political as well as religious discussions, and his inability to grasp the conception of compromise determined his views on the question of non-resistance. If we resist the Emperor, he said, we must expel him and become Emperor ourselves; then the Emperor will resist, and there will be no end until one party is crushed. Tolerance was not in his nature, and concession in Church or in State was to him evidence of indifference or weakness. Truth and falsehood, right and wrong, were both absolute. The Papacy embodied abuses, therefore the Pope was Antichrist; Caesar's authority was recognised by Christ, therefore all resistance was sin.

Between Luther's political doctrines and those of Zwingli there was as much antipathy as between their theology Appropriately, the statue of Luther at Worms represents him armed only with a Bible, while that of Zwingli at Zurich bears a Bible in one hand and a sword in the other. Zwingli had first been stirred to public protest by a secular evil, the corruption of his country by foreign gold; and political aims were

inextricably interwoven with religious objects throughout his career. He hoped for a union both spiritual and temporal between Zurich and Bern and the cities of South Germany, by means of which Emperor and Pope should alike be eliminated, and a democratic republic established; aristocracy, he declared, had always been the ruin of States. Under the influence of this idea a civic affiliation had been arranged between Constance and Zurich in 1527, and extended to St Gallen, Basel, Mülhausen in Elsass, and Biel in 1529; and it was partly to further this organisation and to counteract the alliance of Austria with the five Catholic cantons that Zwingli journeyed to Marburg.

But the primary objects of the conference were theological, and it was on a dispute over the Eucharist that the differences between the two parties came to a head On all other points Zwingli went to the limit of concession, but he could not accept the doctrine of consubstantiation. Luther chalked on the table round which they sat, the text "This is my Body," and nothing could move him from its literal interpretation. Zwingli, on the other hand, explained the phrase by referring to the sixth chapter of St John, and declared that "is" meant only "represents"; the bread and the wine represented the body and blood, as a portrait represents a real person. Christ was only figuratively "the door" and the "true vine"; and the Eucharist instead of being a miracle was, in his eyes, only a feast of commemoration. This doctrine was anathema to Luther; at the end of the debate Zwingli offered him his hand, but Luther rejected it, saying "Your spirit is not our spirit." As a final effort at compromise Luther was induced to draw up the fifteen Marburg Articles, of which the Zwinglians signed all but the one on the Eucharist; and it was agreed that each party should moderate the asperity of its language towards the other. But this did not prevent the Lutheran divines from denying that Zwinglians could be members of the Church of Christ, or Luther himself from writing a few days afterwards that they were "not only liars, but the very incarnation of lying, deceit, and hypocrisy, as Carlstadt and Zwingli show by their very deeds and words." The hand which had pulled down the Roman Church in Germany made the first rent in the Church which was beginning to grow up in its place. Zwingli went back to Zurich to meet his death two years later at Kappel, and the Lutherans returned home to ponder on the fate which the approach of Charles V had in store.

Their stubborn determination to sacrifice everything on the altar of dogma was as fatal to plans for their internal defence as it had been to their alliance with Zwingli. A few weeks after the Marburg Conference a meeting was held at Schwabach to consider the basis of common action between the north German Princes and the south German cities. As a preparation for this attempt at concord Luther drew up another series of seventeen articles in which he emphasised the points at issue

between him and Zwingli, and persuaded the Lutheran Princes to admit no one to their alliance who would not subscribe to every single dogma in this formulary. As a natural result Strassburg and Ulm refused to sign the articles at Schwabach, and in this refusal they were joined by the other south German cities at a further conference held at Schmalkalden in December. Luther even managed to shake the defensive understanding between Hesse and Saxony by persuading the Elector of the unlawfulness of any resistance to the Emperor. The Reformer was fortified in this attitude by a child-like faith—which Ferdinand was sagacious enough to encourage—in Charles' pacific designs, although the Emperor had denounced the Protest from Spain, was pledged by his treaty with the Pope to the extirpation of heresy, and arrested the Protestant envoys who appeared before him in Italy. So the far-reaching designs of Philip of Hesse and Zwingli for the defence of the Reformation were brought to naught at the moment when the horizon was clouding in every quarter.

In May, 1530, having in conjunction with Clement VII regulated the affairs of Italy and discussed schemes for regulating those of the world, Charles V crossed the Alps on his second visit to his German dominions The auspices in 1530 were very different from those of 1521. Then he had left Spain in open rebellion, he was threatened with war by the most powerful State in Europe, and the attitude of the Papacy was still doubtful. Now Spain was reduced to obedience and the Pope to impotence; France had suffered the greatest defeat of the century; Italy lay at his feet; and Ferdinand had added two kingdoms to the family estate. Over every obstacle Charles seemed to have triumphed. But in Germany the universal agitation against Rome had resolved itself into two organised parties which threatened to plunge the nation into civil war Here indeed was the scene of the last of Hercules' labours; would his good fortune or skill yield him a final triumph?

It is doubtful whether Charles had formed any clear idea of the policy he must adopt, and it is certain that his ignorance of German methods of thought and character and his incapacity to understand religious enthusiasm led him to underrate the stubbornness of the forces with which he had to deal. But his inveterate habit of silence stood him in good stead; Luther regarded with awe the monarch who said less in a year than he himself said in a day. Campeggi, who accompanied Charles on his march, daily instilled in his ear the counsels of prompt coercion; and the death of the politic Gattinara at Innsbruck was so opportune a removal of a restraining influence that Lutherans ascribed his end to Italian poison. It was, however, inconsistent with the Emperor's nature to resort to force before every method of accommodation had been tried and failed. In 1521 he refused to act on the papal Bull against Luther without a personal attempt at mediation; in 1530 he would not proceed against the Protestants by force of arms until he

d tried the effect of moral suasion, and there is no need to regard the endly terms in which he summoned the Luthéran Princes to the Diet Augsburg as merely a cloak to conceal his hostile designs.

The Diet opened on June 20, 1530, and was very fully attended. ıther, who was still under the ban of the Empire, could come no arer than Coburg; his place as preceptor of the Protestant Princes s taken by Melanchthon; and the celebrated Confession of Augsburg, ough it was based on Luther's Schwabach Articles, was exclusively elanchthon's work. The attitude of the Lutheran divines is well pressed by the tone of this document; they were clearly on the fensive, and the truculent Luther himself, who had dictated terms to e Archbishop of Mainz, was now reduced to craving his favour. elanchthon was almost prostrated by the fear of religious war; and thought it could best be averted by an alliance between Catholics d Lutherans against the Zwinglians, whom he regarded as no better an Anabaptists. His object in framing the Confession was therefore ofold, to minimise the differences between Lutherans and Catholics, d to exaggerate those between Lutherans and Zwinglians; he hoped us to heal the breach with the former and complete it with the ter.

In form the Confession is an *apologia*, and not a creed; it does not ert expressly the truth of any dogma, but merely states the fact that ch doctrines are taught in Lutheran churches, and justifies that ching on the ground that it varies little if at all from that of the urch of Rome. It does not deny the divine right of the Papacy, e *character indelebilis* of the priesthood, or the existence of seven craments; it does not assert the doctrine of predestination, which d brought Luther into conflict with Erasmus; and the doctrine the Eucharist is so ambiguously expressed that the only fault the tholics found was its failure to assert categorically the fact of transubntiation. In view of the substantial agreement which it endeavoured establish between Catholic and Lutheran dogma, it was represented unjustifiable to exclude the Reformers from the Catholic Church; eir only quarrel with their opponents was about traditions and abuses, d their object was not polemic or propaganda, but merely toleration r themselves.

This Confession was to have been read at a public session of the Diet June 24; but, apparently through Ferdinand's intervention, the plan s changed to a private recitation in the Emperor's apartments, and ere it was read on the 25th by the Saxon Chancellor, Bayer. Philip Hesse was loth to subscribe so mild a pronouncement, but eventually was signed by all the original Protestant Princes, with the addition of e Elector's son, John Frederick, and by two cities, Nürnberg and eutlingen. But the door was completely shut on the Zwinglians; in m Bucer and Capito sought an arrangement with Melanchthon. He

would not even consent to see them lest he should be compromised, and Lutheran pulpits resounded with denunciations of the Sacramentarians, as Zwingli and his supporters now began to be called. Zwingli himself, so soon as he read the Confession, addressed to Charles a statement of his own belief, in which he threw prudence and fear to the winds. He retracted the concessions he had made to Lutheran views at Marburg, and asserted his differences from the Catholic Church in such plain terms that Melanchthon said he was mad. The cities of Upper Germany were not prepared for such extremities; but, cut off from the Lutheran communion, they were compelled to draw up a confession of their own, which was named the *Tetrapolitana* from the four cities, Strassburg, Constance, Lindau, and Memmingen, which signed it. It was mainly the work of Bucer, was completed on July 11, and, while Zwinglian in essence, made a serious attempt to approach the doctrines of Wittenberg.

It appears to have been the hope of the Protestants, and probably of Charles also, that the Emperor would be able to make himself the mediator between the Lutherans and Catholics, and to effect an agreement by inducing each side to make concessions. But for the moment the Catholics distrusted Charles more than the Protestants did. They had secular as well as ecclesiastical grievances. They denounced the treaties concluded in Italy as wanting their concurrence; they were horrified at the example set by Charles in secularising the see of Utrecht, and they refused to confirm the Pope's grant of ecclesiastical revenues to Ferdinand; while the orthodox Wittelsbachs were moving heaven and earth to prevent the election of Charles' brother as King of the Romans. They were thus by no means disposed to place themselves in the Emperor's hands; they insisted rather that they should determine the Empire's policy, and that Charles should merely execute their decrees; and, lacking the Emperor's broader outlook, they were less inclined to make concessions to peace. It was the growing conviction that Charles was a helpless tool in the hands of their enemies which caused a revulsion of the Protestant feeling in his favour.

Yet the Catholics were not all in favour of extreme courses, and either Melanchthon's moderation or the effect of twelve years' criticism produced some modification of Catholic dogma, as expressed in the Confutation of the Confession drawn up by Eck, Faber, Cochlaeus, and others, and presented on August 3. The doctrine of good works was so defined as to guard against the previous popular abuses of it; and in other respects there were signs of the process of purifying Catholic dogma which had commenced at the Congress of Ratisbon in 1524 and was completed at the Council of Trent. But these concessions were too slight to satisfy even Melanchthon; and the Protestant Princes were not frightened into submission by the threats of Charles that unless they returned to the Catholic fold he would proceed against them as became the protector and steward of the Church.

Neither side was, however, prepared for religious war; and, when the Confutation and Charles' menaces failed to precipitate unity, a series of confused and lengthy negotiations between the various parties, the Emperor, the Pope, the Catholic majority, and the Lutherans was initiated. In the course of these Melanchthon receded still further from the Protestant standpoint. He offered on behalf of the Lutherans to recognise episcopal authority, auricular confession and fasts, and undertook to regard the Communion in both kinds and the marriage of priests, which he had before demanded, as merely temporary concessions pending the convocation of a General Council. He even went so far as to assert that the Lutherans admitted papal authority, adhered to papal doctrine, and that this was the reason for their unpopularity in Germany. On the other hand, the Catholic members of the commission appointed to discuss the question were ready to concede a communion *sub utrâque*, on condition that the Lutherans would acknowledge communion in one kind to be equally valid, and declare the adoption of either form to be a matter of indifference.

Melanchthon was prepared to make these admissions, but his party refused to follow him any further. Luther grew restive at Coburg, and began to talk of the impossibility of reconciling Christ with Belial, and Luther with the Pope; to restore episcopal jurisdiction was, he thought, equivalent to putting their necks in the hangman's rope, and on September 20 he expressed a preference for risking war to making further concessions. If the Catholics would not receive the Confession or the Gospel, he wrote to Melanchthon with a characteristic allusion to Judas, "let them go to their own place." The Princes had never been so timorous as the divines. They were not so much concerned for the unity of the Empire as Melanchthon was for that of the Church. Philip of Hesse told the Emperor he would sacrifice life and limb for his faith, and long before the Diet had reached its conclusion he rode off without asking the Emperor's leave. The Elector's fortitude was such that Luther declared the Diet of Augsburg had made him into a hero, and lesser Princes were not less constant. Their steadfastness and the uncompromising attitude of the Catholics stiffened the backs of the Lutheran divines; and, in reply to a taunt that the Confutation had demolished the Confession, they presented an Apology for the latter, the tone of which was much less humble. No agreement being now expected, the Catholic majority of the Estates drew up a proposal for the Recess on September 22. The Protestants were given till April 15 to decide whether they would conform or not, and meanwhile they were ordered to make no innovations on their own account, to put no constraint on Catholics in their territories, and to assist the Emperor to eradicate Zwinglians and Anabaptists. Against this proposal the Protestant Princes again protested; fourteen cities, including Augsburg itself, followed their example; and they then departed, leaving the Catholic

majority to pursue its own devices, and to discover within itself opportunities for division.

The failure of Melanchthon's plan of attaining peace with Catholics by breach with the Zwinglians produced a certain reaction of feeling and policy. Luther was, partially at any rate, disabused of his faith in Charles' intentions, and the pressure of common danger facilitated a renewed attempt at union. With this object in view, Bucer, the chief author of the *Tetrapolitana*, called on Luther at Coburg on September 25, and was received with surprising favour. Luther even expressed a willingness to lay down his life three times if only the dissensions among the Reformers might be healed, and Bucer himself had a genius for accommodation. Under these favourable circumstances he contrived to evolve a plausible harmonisation of the Wittenberg and Tetrapolitan doctrines of the Eucharist which was sufficient for the day and led to an invitation of the south German cities to the meeting of Protestant Powers to be held in December at Schmalkalden.

Meanwhile the Catholic majority of the Diet continued its deliberations at Augsburg. The aid against the Turks which Charles desired had not yet been voted, and before he obtained it the Emperor had to drop his demand for Ferdinand's ecclesiastical endowment, and promise to press upon the Pope the redress of the hundred *gravamina* which were once more revived. Substantial concessions to individual Electors secured the prospect of Ferdinand's election as King of the Romans, which took place at Cologne on January 5, 1531; and the Diet concluded with the adoption of the Recess on November 19. The Edict of Worms was to be put into execution, episcopal jurisdictions were to be maintained, and Church property to be restored. Of more practical importance than these resolutions was the reconstitution of the *Reichskammergericht*, which henceforward began to play an important part in imperial politics. It was now organised so as to be an efficient instrument in carrying out the will of the majority, and was solemnly pledged to the suppression of Lutheranism. The campaign was to open, not on a field of battle, but in the Courts of law, and the attack was to be directed, not against the persons of Lutheran Princes, but against their secularisation of Church property. Countless suits were already pending before the *Kammergericht*, and, however inconsistent such a policy may have been in the Habsburgs who had themselves profited largely by secularisation, the law of the Empire gave the *Kammergericht* no option but to decide against the Lutherans, and its decisions would have completely undermined the foundations of the rising Lutheran Church.

This resort to law instead of to arms is characteristic of Charles' caution. Backed as he was by an overwhelming majority of the Diet, it might seem that the Emperor would make short work of the dissident Princes and towns. But in German imperial politics there was usually many a slip between judgment and execution; and of the Princes who

voted for the Recess of Augsburg there were only two, the Elector Joachim of Brandenburg and Duke George of Saxony, who were ready to face a civil war for the sake of their convictions. In Germany were reproduced on a smaller scale all those elements of disunion which had made the attempted crusades of the previous century ridiculous fiascos. Each Catholic Prince desired the suppression of heresy, but no one would set his face against the enemy for fear of being stabbed in the back by a friend. The rulers of Bavaria and Austria were both unimpeachably orthodox, but Bavaria was again intriguing with Hesse against the House of Habsburg. The Emperor himself had few troops and no money. The multiplicity of interests pressing upon his attention prevented his concentration upon any one object, and increased his natural indecision of character. Never was his policy more hesitating and circumspect than in 1530–1 when fortune seemed to have placed the ball at his feet.

His inactivity enabled the Protestants to mature their plans and organise an effective bond of resistance. The doctrine of implicit obedience to the Emperor broke down as danger approached; the divines naively admitted that they had not before realised that the sovereign power was subject to law; and Luther, acknowledging that he was a child in temporal matters, allowed himself to be persuaded that Charles was not the Caesar of the New Testament, but a governor whose powers were limited by the Electors in the same way as the Roman consul's by the Senate, the Doge's by the Venetian Council, and a Bishop's by his Chapter. The Protestants, having already denied that a minority could be bound by a majority of the Diet, now carried the separatist principle a step further by declaring that the Empire was a federated aristocracy of independent sovereigns, who were themselves to judge when and to what extent they would yield obedience to their elected president. It is not, however, fair to charge them with adopting Protestantism in order to further their claims to political independence; it is more correct to say that they extended their particularist ideas in order to protect their religious principles.

The first care of the Princes and burghers who deliberated at Schmalkalden from December 22 to 31, 1530, was to arrange for common action with regard to the litigation before the *Reichskammergericht.* But the decision which gave their meeting its real importance was their agreement to form a league for mutual defence against all attacks on account of their faith, from whatever quarter these might proceed. This, the first sketch of the Schmalkaldic League, was subscribed by the Elector of Saxony, the Landgrave of Hesse, the Brunswick-Luneburg Dukes, Prince Wolfgang of Anhalt, the two Counts of Mansfeld, and the cities of Magdeburg and Bremen. Margrave George of Brandenburg and the city of Nürnberg were not yet prepared to take the decisive step; and, although the Tetrapolitan cities, reinforced by Ulm, Biberach, Isny,

and Reutlingen, expressed their concurrence in the League at a second meeting in February, 1531, and three Dukes of Brunswick, Philip, Otto, and Francis, and the city of Lübeck also acceded to it, its full and final development depended upon the result of the contest then raging between Lutherans and Zwinglians for control of the south German cities.

Bucer, after his partial success with Luther at Coburg, proceeded to Zurich in the hope of bringing Zwingli to the point of concession where Luther had come to meet him. But as the German Reformer grew more conciliatory, the Swiss became more uncompromising. In February, 1531, the Swiss cities refused to join the Schmalkaldic League, and in the same month a Congress of Zwinglian divines at Memmingen attacked the Catholic ceremonial observed in Lutheran churches. This aggressive attitude may be traced to the rapid progress which Zwinglian doctrines were making in south Germany at the expense of the Augsburg Confession. At Augsburg itself the Tetrapolitan or Bucerian creed defeated its Lutheran rival; and in other German cities more violent manifestations of the Zwinglian spirit prevailed. Under the influence of Bucer, Blarer, and Oecolampadius, Ulm, Reutlingen, Biberach, and other hitherto Lutheran cities destroyed pictures, images, and organs in their churches, and selected pastors who looked for inspiration to Zurich and not to Wittenberg; those cities which had already joined the Schmalkaldic League refused at its meeting at Frankfort in June to subscribe to the League's project for military defence. South Germany seemed in fact to be about to fall like ripe fruit into Zwingli's lap, when his power suddenly waned at home, and the defeat of Kappel (October 11, 1531) cut short his life, and ruined his cause in Germany; it was left for Calvin to gather up the fragments of Zwingli's German party, and to establish an ultra-Protestant opposition to the Lutheran Church.

This unexpected disaster to the Reformation in Switzerland appeared to Ferdinand to offer a magnificent opportunity for crushing the movement in Germany. He was thoroughly convinced that Swiss political and religious radicalism was the most formidable of the enemies of German Catholicism and the Habsburg monarchy, and that deprived of this stimulant the milder Lutheran disease would soon yield to vigorous treatment. He proposed to his brother an armed support of the Five Catholic cantons, and the forcible restoration of Catholicism in Zurich and Bern. But the Emperor declined to involve himself in a Swiss campaign. His intervention in Switzerland would, he feared, precipitate war with Francis I, who was already beginning again to cast longing eyes on Milan, and feeling his way to an understanding with Clement VII. The Pope's fear of a General Council, which Catholics no less than Protestants were demanding from Charles V, was a powerful weapon in the hands of Francis I. Clement was haunted by the suspicion that a

Council might be as fatal to him as that of Basel had threatened to be to his predecessors; and the Emperor's enemies suggested that if it met Charles would propose the restoration of the Papal States to the Empire from which they had been wrung. Rather than risk such a fate, some at least of his friends urged Clement to accede to the Lutheran demand for communion in both kinds and clerical marriage, and maintained that the Augsburg Confession was not repugnant to the Catholic faith. Without the help of the heretics it seemed impossible for Charles to resist the approaching Turkish onslaught; and the Emperor's confessor, Loaysa, urged him not to trouble if their souls went to hell, so long as they served him on earth. And so the term of grace accorded to the Lutherans by the Recess of Augsburg expired in April, 1531, without a thought of resort to compulsion; and instead of this, the Emperor suspended, on July 8, the action of the *Reichskammergericht.* He had missed the golden opportunity; it did not recur for fifteen years, during which two wars with the Turk in Europe, two wars in Africa, and two wars with France distracted his attention from German affairs.

This inaction on Charles' part cooled the martial ardour of the Schmalkaldic League; and Zwinglian aggression in south Germany increased their disinclination to help the Swiss in their domestic troubles. In reality the battle of Kappel was of greater advantage to Luther than to the Emperor. For a second time the Reformation was freed from the embarrassment of a mutinous left wing; and Luther, although he professed to lament Zwingli's fate, regarded the battle as the judgment of God, and Zwingli as damned unless the Almighty made an irregular exception in his favour. The cities of Upper Germany, deprived of their mainstay at Zurich, gravitated in the direction of Wittenberg; while the defeat of one section of the Reformers convinced the rest of the need for common defence. Under the pressure of these circumstances the Schmalkaldic League completed its organisation, and of necessity assumed a predominantly Lutheran and territorial character. At two conferences held at Nordhausen and Frankfort (November–December, 1531) the military details of the League were settled, and the respective contributions of its various members fixed; the Princes obtained a large majority of votes in its council of war and exclusive command of its armies. Saxony and Hesse were treated as equal; if the seat of war was in Saxony or Westphalia the supreme command was to fall to the Elector, if in Hesse or Upper Germany to the Landgrave.

The accession of Göttingen, Goslar, and Eimbeck to the League, and the success of the Reformation at Hamburg, at Rostock, and in Denmark, where Christian's return to Catholicism brought no nearer his restoration to the throne, left the Schmalkaldic League in almost undisputed possession of north Germany; and it became a veritable *imperium in imperio* with a foreign policy of its own. It might now be

reckoned one of the anti-Habsburg powers in Europe; its agents sought alliance with France, England, Denmark, and Venice; and it began to regard itself as a League not merely for self-defence within the Empire, but for the furtherance of the Protestant cause all over Europe. Nor were its aims exclusively religious; theology merged into politics, and Protestantism sometimes laboured under the suspicion of being merely anti-imperialism. France and Venice had few points in common with Luther; and Philip of Hesse's plan to utilise a Turkish invasion for the restoration of Ulrich of Württemberg outraged patriotic sentiment. On the Catholic side Bavarian objects were no less selfish; and the Wittelsbachs endeavoured to undermine Ferdinand's supports against the Turk in Germany, Bohemia, and Hungary. In both professedly religious camps there was political double-dealing; Hesse was ready to side with either Austria or Bavaria; while the Wittelsbachs fomented Charles' hostility to the Lutherans and denounced his concessions as treason to the faith, at the same time that they were hand in glove with Hesse for an attack on the Habsburg power.

These extreme and unpatriotic schemes were defeated by a tacit understanding between Catholic and Protestant moderates; and Germany presented a fairly united front to its infidel foe. Saxony and cities like Ulm and Nurnberg convinced Charles that the coming of the Turk would be used for no sectional purposes; and the Emperor in return promised the Lutherans at least a temporary peace. He turned a deaf ear to the demands at the Diet of Ratisbon (April, 1532) for the execution of the Augsburg Recess, while Luther denounced the claims of his forward friends to toleration for all future Protestants even in Catholic territories as impossible and unreasonable. At Nurnberg (July 23, 1532) an agreement was reached by which all suits against the Protestants before the *Reichskammergericht* were quashed and they were guaranteed peace until the next Diet or a General Council. The understanding was to be kept secret for fear of offending the Catholics, but it sufficed to open to Charles the armouries of the Protestant cities, and Nürnberg sent double its quota to serve in the Turkish campaign.

Ferdinand had in vain sought to stave off the attack by which Solyman hoped to revenge his defeat at Vienna. He offered first to pay tribute for Hungary, and then to cede it to Zapolya on condition that it returned to the Habsburgs on Zapolya's death. These terms were rejected with scorn, and on April 26 the Sultan commenced his march. His army was reckoned at a quarter of a million men, the stereotyped estimate of Turkish invading forces, but half of these were non-combatants; the Emperor's troops did not exceed eighty thousand, but they were well equipped and eager for the fray. The same enthusiasm was not conspicuous in the Turkish ranks; they were foiled by the heroic resistance of Guns (August 7-28) and made no serious attempt either to take Vienna or to come to close quarters with the imperial forces; in

September they commenced their retreat through Carinthia and Croatia, which they ravaged on their way.

The precipitate withdrawal of the Turks was followed by an equally sudden abandonment of the campaign by Charles V. After all his brave words it was a shock to his friends and admirers when he made no effort to seize the fruits of victory and recover Hungary for his brother; for a vigorous prosecution of the war in 1532 might have restored to Christendom lands which remained under Turkish rule for nearly two centuries longer. There are explanations enough for his course; the German levies refused to pass the imperial frontiers, regarding self-defence as the limit of their duty; the Spaniards and Italians confined their efforts mainly to pillaging German villages; and Cranmer, who accompanied Charles' Court, describes how they spread greater desolation than the Turks themselves and how the peasants in revenge fell upon and slew the Emperor's troops whenever opportunity offered; so that delay in disbanding his army might have fanned the enmity between Charles' German and Spanish subjects into war. But other reasons accounted for the Emperor's departure from Germany, which was once more sacrificed to the exigencies of Charles' cosmopolitan interests. The Pope, irritated alike by the Emperor's bestowal of Modena and Reggio on the Duke of Ferrara, and by his persistence in demanding a General Council, was proposing to marry his niece Catharine de' Medici to Henry, Duke of Orleans; and a union between Clement and Francis I would again have threatened Charles' position in Italy. He regarded two objects as then of transcendent importance, the reconciliation of the Pope and the convocation of a General Council. They were quite incompatible, yet to them Charles sacrificed the chance of regaining Hungary.

The result can only be described as a comprehensive failure. The Emperor's interviews with Clement in February, 1533, did not prevent the Pope's alliance with France, nor his sanction of Cranmer's appointment to the see of Canterbury, which enabled Henry VIII to complete his divorce from Catharine of Aragon. Charles' two years' stay in Germany had effected little; Ferdinand, indeed, was King of the Romans but his influence was less than before, while the power of the Protestants had been greatly increased. The Emperor had crossed the Alps in the spring of 1530 with a record of almost unbroken success; he recrossed them in the autumn of 1532 having added a list of failures; the German labour had proved herculean, but Charles had proved no Hercules. For another decade Germany was left to fight out its own political and religious quarrels with little help or hindrance from its sovereign. His intervention in 1530–2 had brought peace to no one; the Protestants had little security against the attacks of the *Reichskammergericht*; the Catholics were unable to prevent the progress of heresy; and while Charles was journeying farther and farther away from Germany the

Habsburg authority in the Empire was threatened with one of the most serious checks it experienced.

The restoration of Duke Ulrich of Württemberg was not merely a favourite design of the Protestants for the extension of the Reformation in south Germany; it was regarded by German Catholic Princes and by the Emperor's foreign foes as an invaluable means of undermining the Habsburg power. It is even believed that Clement VII himself in his anger at Charles' persistent demand for a General Council, discussed the execution of this plan at his interview with Francis I at Marseilles in the autumn of 1533. At any rate the French King went from Marseilles to Bar-le-duc, where in January, 1534, he agreed with Philip of Hesse to give the enterprise extensive financial support, cloaked under a fictitious sale of Montbéliard (the property of Ulrich) to the French King. The moment was opportune. Ferdinand was busy in Bohemia and Hungary; the outbreak of the Anabaptist revolution gave Philip of Hesse an excuse for arming; and the decrepitude of the Swabian League neutralised the force by which Wurttemberg had been won and maintained for the Austrian House. Religious divisions had impaired the harmony of the League, and political jealousies had transformed it from a willing tool of the Habsburgs into an almost hostile power. In November, 1532, the Electors of Trier and the Palatinate and Philip of Hesse had agreed to refuse a renewal of the League; and in May, 1533, some of its most important city members, Ulm, Nurnberg, and Augsburg, formed a separate alliance for the defence of freedom of conscience. The strictly defensive Catholic confederation established at Halle in ducal Saxony in the following November between the Elector Joachim of Brandenburg, Dukes George of Saxony, Eric and Henry of Brunswick, was neither a match for the Schmalkaldic League, nor had it any interest in the perpetuation of Austrian rule in Wurttemberg. Joachim told Philip that Ferdinand would get no help from the Electors; and his words proved true indeed. The Archbishops of Mainz and Trier observed a strict neutrality; the Elector Palatine's promise of aid was delusive; while the Catholic bishop of Munster and Duke Henry of Brunswick, possibly on the understanding that Philip would assist them to put down the Munster Anabaptists, consented to help him in Wurttemberg, and assurances of support were also forthcoming from Henry VIII, Christian III of Denmark, and Zapolya.

In 1532 Ulrich's son Christopher, alarmed at the prospect of being carried off to Spain, escaped from the Emperor's Court during the Turkish campaign, and in the following year appeared at a meeting of the Swabian League at Augsburg. His cause was warmly advocated by a French envoy and almost unanimously approved by the League. Bavaria, indeed, wished to restore Christopher, who had been educated as a Catholic, instead of his father, a strenuous Protestant, and on this score quarrelled with Philip of Hesse. But French aid enabled Philip

to dispense with Bavarian assistance. In April, 1534, he mustered a well-equipped army of 20,000 foot and 4000 horse, and on the 12th a manifesto was issued to the people of Württemberg, who, disgusted with Ferdinand's rule, were eager to rise on Ulrich's behalf. It was in vain that Luther and Melanchthon prophesied woe for this contempt of their doctrine of passive obedience. Philip knew the feebleness of the foe; Ferdinand's appeals to Charles had met with a cold response, and his lieutenant in Wurttemberg, Count Philip of the Palatinate, could hardly raise 9000 foot and 400 horse. With this little army he waited at Lauffen, where on May 12–13 an encounter, which can scarcely be called a battle, was decided against him, mainly by the excellence of the Hessian horse and artillery. Before the end of June the whole of Württemberg had been overrun by the invaders, and Luther had discerned the hand of God in the victors' triumph.

Nor was there any hope of retrieving the disaster; rather, Ferdinand dreaded lest Philip should with the help of the Anabaptists raise a general insurrection against the Habsburgs, and seize the imperial crown for himself, the Dauphin of France, or Duke William of Bavaria. Francis I regarded Wurttemberg as only a beginning, and was urging Philip on to fresh conquests, which would have helped him in his impending war with Charles. But the German Princes were content with securing their immediate objects without becoming the cat's-paw of France, and peace was made with Ferdinand at Cadan on June 29. Ulrich was restored to Württemberg, but Ferdinand's pride was to some extent saved by the provision that the duchy was to be held as a fief of Austria—without however impairing its imperial status—and should pass to the Habsburgs in default of male heirs in Ulrich's line; at the same time Ferdinand withdrew his original stipulation that the Reformation should not be established in Württemberg.

The Protestants, however, were bent upon more than a local victory for their faith, and they employed their advantage over Ferdinand to render more secure their general position in Germany. The great defect in the Nürnberg Peace of 1532 was the absence of any definition of the "religious cases" with which the *Reichskammergericht* was prohibited from dealing. When the Court appealed to Charles on the point, he replied that it was their business to determine what was, and what was not a "religious" suit; and as the Court was composed of Catholics it naturally asserted its jurisdiction in all suits about ecclesiastical property. But secularisation of Church property was the financial basis of the reformed Churches, and by this time was also one of the main financial supports of Lutheran States. If they could be attacked on this ground the Peace of Nürnberg was of little value to them; and they grew more and more exasperated as the *Kammergericht* proceeded to condemn cities and Princes such as Strassburg and Nurnberg, Duke Ernest of Luneburg and Margrave George of Brandenburg. Eventually, on January 30, 1534,

the Protestants formally repudiated the *Kammergericht* as a partisan body, thus rejecting the last existing national institution, for the *Reichsregiment* was already dissolved. This however afforded them no protection, and in the Peace of Cadan they insisted that Ferdinand should quash all such proceedings of the Chamber as were directed against the members of the Schmalkaldic League. With this demand the King was forced to comply; the only compensation he received was the withdrawal of the Elector of Saxony's opposition to his recognition as King of the Romans. It was no wonder that men declared that Philip of Hesse had done more for the Reformation by his Wurttemberg enterprise than Luther could do in a thousand books.

Other causes than the weakness of Ferdinand and the disinclination of Lutherans to promote the ends of Francis I moved Catholic and Protestant Princes to the Peace of Cadan. Both alike were threatened by their common foe, the spirit of revolution, which in two different forms had now submerged Catholic Munster and Protestant Lubeck. Of the two phenomena the Anabaptist reign at Münster was the more to be feared and the harder to be explained, for the term by which it is known represents a mere accident of the movement as being its essence. It was not essentially theological, nor is "anabaptist" an adequate or accurate expression of its theological peculiarities. The doctrines of second baptism and adult baptism are inoffensive enough, but attempts to realise the millennium, if successful, would be fatal to most forms of government, and a familiar parallel to the Munster revolutionists may be found in the English Fifth-monarchy men of the seventeenth century. In both cases millenary doctrines were only the outward form in which the revolutionary spirit was made manifest, and the spirit of revolution is always at bottom the same because it has its roots in the depths of human nature. The motive force which roused the English peasants in 1381 was essentially the same as that which dominated Münster in 1534 and lined the barricades of Paris in 1848. The revolutionist becomes a believer in the brotherhood of man, in the perfectibility of the race, and in the practicability of the millennium. The narrower his experience of men and affairs, the wider his flights of fancy; and revolutionary principles commonly find their most fruitful soil among hand-workers of sedentary occupation and straitened circumstances. In those submerged classes materials for discontent ever abound, awaiting the coincidence of two events to set them free, the flash of vision into better things and the disturbance of the repressive force of law and order. The Reformation produced them both; and the new gospel of Divine justice for the oppressed set the volcanic flood in motion, and strife between Catholic and Protestant authorities gave it a vent.

It was not to be expected that the rigid, respectable condition into which Lutheranism had sunk under the aegis of territorial Princes or even the more elastic religion of Zwingli would satisfy all of those

who had revolted from Rome. Extreme opinions soon became heard. Sebastian Franck declared that in the new Lutheran Church there was less freedom of speech and belief than among the Turks and heathen; and Leo Jud described Luther as another Pope who consigned at will some to the devil, and rewarded others with heaven. Luther had found his original strength in the spirit of revolutionary enthusiasm and religious exaltation; but as soon as the way was clear he exchanged the support of popular agitation for that of secular authority, and left the revolutionists to follow their own devices. Their ranks were swollen by a general feeling of disappointment at the meagre results of the Reformation. The moral regeneration which had been anticipated, the amelioration of social ills, and the reform of political abuses seemed as far off as ever. "The longer we preach the Gospel," declared Luther, "the deeper the people plunge into greed, pride, and luxury"; and, acting on a principle enunciated by the Reformers themselves, men began to ascribe the evil practice in Lutheran spheres to the errors in Lutheran doctrine. Hence arose a number of theological ideas, which were anathema alike to Catholics and Protestants, but appealed with irresistible force to multitudes who found no solace in either of the more orthodox creeds. The mass of the peasantry had been put out of the pale of hope in 1525, and their complete indifference to ideas of any kind prevented a general rising ten years later; but in some of the towns the lower classes retained enough mental buoyancy to seek consolation in dreams for the burdens they bore in real life.

The Anabaptist doctrine was but one of an endless variety of ideas, many of which had long been current. All such opinions gained fresh vogue in the decade following the Peasants' Revolt; but most of the "sectaries" agreed in repudiating Luther's views on predestination and the unfree will, and denounced the dependence of the Lutheran Church upon the State. They denied the right of the secular magistrate to interfere in religious matters, and themselves withdrew in varying degrees from concern in the affairs of this world. Some, anticipating the Quakers, refused to bear arms; the *Gartnerbruder* of Salzburg endeavoured to live on the pattern of primitive simplicity. One sect denied the humanity of Christ; another, of whom Ludwig Hetzer was the chief, began by regarding Jesus as a leader and teacher rather than an object of worship, and ended by denying His divinity. Many thoughtful people, repelled by the harshness of Luther's dogmas, insisted upon mercy as the pre-eminent attribute of God, and extended even to the devil the hope of salvation; while the idea that the flesh alone sinned leaving the spirit undefiled proved attractive to the lower sort and opened the door to a variety of antinomian speculations and practices.

Most of these dreamers indulged in Apocalyptic visions of an immediate purification of the world; but this at worst was only a species of

quiet spiritual dram-drinking, and probably it would have gone no further but for the ruthless persecution which their doctrines called down upon them. Zwingli himself was hostile to them, and repressive measures were taken against their Swiss adherents; but in most parts of Germany they were condemned to wholesale death. Six hundred executions are said to have taken place at Ensisheim in Upper Elsass, a thousand in Tyrol and Gorz, and the Swabian League butchered whole bands of them without trial or sentence. Many were beheaded in Saxony with the express approbation of Luther, who regarded their heroism in the face of death as proof of diabolic possession. Duke William of Bavaria made a distinction between those who recanted and those who remained obdurate; the latter were burnt, the former were only beheaded. Bucer at Strassburg was less truculent than Luther; but Philip of Hesse was the only Prince of sufficient moderation to be content with the heretics' incarceration.

The doctrine of passive resistance broke down under treatment like this, and men's sufferings began to set their hands as well as their minds in motion; a conviction developed that it was their duty to assist in effecting the purification which they believed to be imminent. In Augsburg, Hans Hut proclaimed the necessity incumbent upon the saints to purify the world with a double-edged sword, and his disciple, Augustin Bader, prepared a crown, insignia, and jewels for his future kingdom in Israel. Melchior Hofmann told Frederick I of Denmark that he was one of the two sovereigns at whose hands all the firstborn of Egypt should be slain. Not till the vials of wrath had been outpoured could the kingdom of heaven come. Hofmann, who had preached "the true gospel" in Livonia and then had combated Luther's magical doctrine of the Eucharist at Stockholm, Kiel, and Strassburg, had by his voice and his pen acquired great influence over the artisans of northern Germany; and here, where men's dreams had not been rudely dispelled by the ravages of peasants and reprisals of Princes, revolutionary ideas took their deepest root and revolutionary projects appeared most feasible. From 1529 onwards there were outbreaks in not a few north German towns, at Minden, Herford, Lippstadt, and Soest; but it was at Münster and Lubeck that the revolution in two different forms assumed a world-wide importance.

Münster had long been a scene of strife between Catholic and Protestant. The Lutheran attack was at first repelled by the Catholics, and Bernard Rottman, the most prominent of the Reforming divines, was expelled from the city. But he soon returned and established himself in the suburbs, where his preaching produced such an effect on the populace that the Reformers became a majority on the Council and secured control of the city churches. In 1532 the Chapter and the rest of the Catholic clergy, with the minority of the Council, left Münster to concert measures of retaliation with Count Franz von Waldeck, the newly-elected Bishop

of Münster, and with the neighbouring gentry, who for the most part adhered to the old religion. By their action all communication between the city and the external world was cut off; but, threatened with the loss of their rents and commerce, the citizens made a sally on December 26, surprised the Bishop and the chiefs of the Catholic party in their headquarters at Telgte (east of Münster), and carried off a number of prisoners as hostages. Alarm induced the Catholics to accept a compromise in February, by which Lutheranism was to be tolerated in the six parish churches, and Catholicism in the Cathedral and the centre of the city. Lutheranism, however, while acceptable to the wealthier members of the reforming party, no longer satisfied Rottman and the artisans. Rottman gradually adopted the Zwinglian view of the Eucharist and repudiated infant baptism; and, although condemned by the University of Marburg and the Council of Munster, he was not expelled from the city, but continued to propagate his doctrines among the lower orders, and eventually in 1533 determined to strengthen his position by introducing into Münster some Anabaptists from Holland.

In the Netherlands Charles V was enabled by the strength of his position as territorial prince and by means of the Inquisition to exercise an authority in religious matters which was denied him in Germany, but his repression had the effect of stimulating the growth of extremer doctrines. Schismatic movements had long been endemic in the Netherlands, and nowhere else did Melchior Hofmann find so many disciples. Chief among them were Jan Matthys, a baker of Haarlem, and Jan Beuckelssen or Bockelsohn, popularly known as Jan of Leyden. Matthys declared himself to be the Enoch of the new dispensation, and chose twelve apostles to proselytise the six neighbouring provinces. Beuckelssen was one of them; though not yet thirty years of age he had seen much of the world; as a journeyman tailor he had travelled over Europe from Lubeck to Lisbon; abandoning his trade he opened an inn at Leyden, became a leading member of the local *Rederijkers*, and wrote verses and dramas, in which he himself played a part. Finally he fell under the influence of the Scriptural teaching of Hofmann and Matthys, as whose forerunner he journeyed to Münster in January, 1534, and joined forces with Rottman and the Münster Anabaptists.

The arrival of Beuckelssen and his colleagues precipitated the conflict for which the Catholics and Lutherans had armed as early as the previous autumn. After a few days of ominous silence the insurrection broke out on February 9. It was premature; the Conservatives were still the stronger party, but in a moment of hesitation they consented to mutual toleration. The concession was fatal; in a fortnight the fanatical zeal of the revolutionists made thousands of fresh converts, especially among the women; and the legal security they had won in Münster attracted crowds of their fellow sectaries from Holland and the neighbouring German towns. Matthys himself appeared on the scene; at

the municipal election of the 21st the Anabaptists secured a majori on the Council; and Knipperdollinck, the executioner of the sect, beca Burgomaster. Six days later there was a great prayer-meeting of arm Anabaptists in the town-hall. Matthys roused himself from an appare trance to demand in the name of God the expulsion of all who refus conversion. Old and young, mothers with infants in arms, and ba footed children, were driven out into the snow to perish, while the rei of the saints began.

Like the earliest Christians they sought to have all things common, and as a commencement they confiscated the goods of t exiles. To ensure primitive simplicity of worship they next destroy all images, pictures, manuscripts, and musical instruments on which th could lay their hands. Tailors and shoemakers were enjoined to intr duce no new fashions in wearing apparel; gold and silver and jewe were surrendered to the common use; and there was an idea of pushir the communistic principle to its logical extreme by repudiating ind vidual property in wives. The last was apparently offensive to publ opinion even in purified Munster, and the nearest approach to it effect in practice was polygamy, which was not introduced without son sanguinary opposition, and did not probably extend far beyond the circ of Beuckelssen and the leaders of the movement. These eccentriciti were regarded by their authors as a necessary preparation for the secon coming of Christ. That the end of the world was at hand was a commc idea of the day. No one was more thoroughly possessed by it tha Luther; but while he set little store on the Book of Revelation, tl Anabaptists of Munster found in it their chief inspiration. The conceived that they were making straight the path of the Lord b abolishing all human ordinances such as property, marriage, and soci distinctions. The notion was not entirely new; at one end of tl religious scale the Taborites had held somewhat similar views, and a the other, monastic life was also based on renunciation of priva property, of marriage, and of the privilege of rank. The idea o preparing for the Second Advent gave the movement its strength, ar stimulated the revolutionists of Munster to resist for a year and a ha the miseries of a siege and all the forces which Germany could brir against them.

The rule of Matthys the prophet was brought to a sudden end b his death in a sortie at Easter, and his mantle fell upon Jan of Leyde probably a worse but certainly an abler man. His introduction o polygamy provoked resistance from the respectable section led b Mollenbeck, but they were mercilessly butchered after surrender. "H who fires the first shot," cried Jan, in words which might have bee borrowed from Luther's attack on the peasants, "does God a service After his victory he dispensed with the twelve elders who had nominall ruled the new Israel, and by the mouth of his prophet Dusentsch

announced it as the will of God that he should be king of all the world and establish the Fifth Monarchy of the Apocalypse. He assumed the pomp and circumstance of royalty, easily crushed an attempt of Knipperdollinck to supplant him, defeated the besiegers with much slaughter on August 30, 1534, when they tried to take the city by storm, and in October sent out twenty-eight apostles to preach the new kingdom to the neighbouring cities. They were armed with Dusentschur's prophecy of ruin for such as did them harm; but almost all were seized and executed, and a young woman, who attempted to play the part of Judith to the Holofernes of the Bishop of Münster, met with a similar fate.

These misfortunes probably dimmed the faith of the besieged in Münster. Although there were thousands of Anabaptists scattered throughout the north of Germany and the Netherlands, their sporadic risings were all suppressed, and no town but Warendorf accepted Münster's proposals of peace. The Wurttemberg war, which had distracted the Princes of Germany, was over; and the Lübeck war prevented Hanseatic democrats from assisting the people of Münster as effectually as it kept north German Princes from joining the siege. But it was April, 1535, before the mutual jealousies of the various Princes, the dissensions between Catholics and Protestants, the inefficiency of the national military organisation, and the common fear lest Charles V should seize the occasion to extend his Burgundian patrimony at the expense of Germany by appropriating Münster to himself, permitted a joint expedition in aid of the Bishop of Münster, who had hitherto carried on the siege with the help of some Hessian troops. After that the result could not long remain doubtful; but the city offered a stubborn resistance, and it was only by means of treachery that it was taken by assault on the night of June 24. The usual slaughter followed; Jan of Leyden and Knipperdollinck were tortured to death in the market-place with red-hot pincers. Münster was deprived of its privileges as an imperial city; the Bishop's authority and Catholicism were re-established, and a fortress was built to support them. The Anabaptists were dispersed into many lands, and their views exercised a potent influence in England and America in the following century; but the visionary and revolutionary spirit which gave Anabaptism its importance during the German Reformation passed out of it to assume other forms, and Anabaptism slowly became a respectable creed.

Two of the three revolutions which disturbed Germany in 1534–5, the Württemberg war and the Munster insurrection, were thus ended; there remained a third, the attempt of commercial democracy to establish an empire over the shores of the Baltic. The cities of the Hanseatic League had long enjoyed the most complete autonomy, and whatever authority neighbouring Princes and Prelates could claim within the walls of any of them was a mere shadow. Hence the Lutheran Reformation, appealing as it did most powerfully to the burgher class, won an easy

and an early victory in most of these trading communities. But th victory was the beginning rather than the end of strife, for the soci ferment which followed on the religious revolt inevitably produced division between the richer and poorer classes. It bore little relati to differences on religious questions, though here as elsewhere in tl sixteenth century every movement tended to assume a theological gar and the rich naturally favoured conservative forms of religion, while tl poor adopted novel doctrines. Thus risings at Hanover in 1533, . Bremen in 1530–2, and at Brunswick in 1528 were directed part against the old Church and partly against the aristocratic Town Council The chief of these municipal revolutions occurred at Lübeck and Stra sund, but, although the triumph of the democracy was accompanied t a good deal of iconoclasm, and Wullenwever, the leader of the Lübec populace, was accused of Anabaptism, the struggle was really soci and political, or, according to Sastrow, the burgomaster of Greifswal between the respectable and the disreputable classes. In both cities th oligarchic character of the Town Council was abolished, and power wa transferred to demagogues depending on the support of the artisans but the importance of these changes consists not so much in their con stitutional aspect, though this was of considerable significance, as in th effect they produced upon the external policy of the Hanseatic League.

That famous organisation had lost much of the power it wielded i the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Its position was based on . union between the so-called Wendic cities of the Baltic and the town of Westphalia and the Netherlands, and upon the control which the exercised over the united Scandinavian kingdoms, and thus over th whole trade of the Baltic and the North Sea. The most potent voic in the confederation had hitherto been that of Lübeck, but the develop ment of Bruges and Antwerp under the fostering care of their Burgundia rulers provoked a bitter rivalry between the Flemings and the League Lubeck insisted upon the exclusion of Dutch trade from the Baltic, an the Dutch naturally resented this limitation of their commerce. At th same time this loosening of the bond between the eastern and wester cities weakened the League's hold on the Scandinavian kingdoms; an Christian II, who had married Charles V's sister, conceived the idea o utilising his Burgundian allies for the purpose of breaking the domin ation of the Baltic cities. The plan was ruined by Christian's vices, which gained him the hatred of all his subjects and enabled the Lübeckers by timely assistance to Christian's uncle, Frederick, Duke of Holstein to evict their enemy from the throne of Denmark and Norway; simila aid was rendered to Gustavus Vasa, who in the same year (1523) drove Christian out of Sweden; and thus the union of the three Scandinavia kingdoms which had lasted since the Peace of Kalmar (1397) wa permanently broken up.

Christian, however, was not content with his defeat, and with a

view to securing the assistance of his Habsburg brothers-in-law and of Catholic Europe, he abjured his Lutheranism and represented his attempt to regain his thrones as a crusade against heresy. In 1531-2 he overran Norway, but Lübeck blockaded the coast, forced him to capitulate, and procured his lifelong imprisonment at Sonderburg. This outrage on royal majesty, coupled with the mercantile hostility between Lübeck and the Netherlands, precipitated naval war between the Dutch and Baltic cities; and the situation was complicated by the death of Frederick I in April, 1533. Several claimants for his vacant throne appeared. Frederick left two sons, Christian III, a Lutheran, and John, who seems to have entertained some hopes of maintaining his pretensions by the help of the Catholic party. The old King, Christian II, was regarded as impossible, and the Habsburgs put forward as their candidate Count Frederick of the Palatinate (afterwards the Elector Palatine Frederick II), who married old Christian's daughter. Such was the situation with which the democrats of Lubeck, who had obtained control of the Council in February and elected Jurgen Wullenwever Burgomaster in March, 1533, had to deal.

The distrust with which the revolutionists of Lübeck were viewed by both Protestant and Catholic Princes made Wullenwever's course a difficult one. He started for Copenhagen to conclude an alliance between the two cities, but Copenhagen looked on him askance, and he then offered his friendship to the young Christian III with no better result. Lubeck, however, found an unexpected ally in Henry VIII, who was then trying every means to reduce the Habsburg power, and regarded with alarm the prospect of a Habsburg victory in Denmark. Marx Meyer, a military adventurer who had taken service under Lubeck, had been sent to sea in command of a fleet against the Dutch. Landing in England without a passport, he had been lodged in the Tower of London; but Henry saw in him a convenient instrument against the Habsburgs. He conferred on Meyer a knighthood, and promised Lübeck assistance; while the Lübeckers undertook to tolerate no Prince upon the Danish throne of whom the English King did not approve. But Henry's promises were not very serious, and the Lubeckers were wise in not putting too much trust in them. They were better advised in concluding a four years' truce with the Netherlands at the price of free trade through the Sound in order to concentrate their efforts upon establishing their control over Denmark.

The element on which they relied was the democratic spirit in the Scandinavian kingdoms and particularly in the towns. Melchior Hofmann had preached at Stockholm, where Gustavus Vasa declared that the populace aimed at his assassination. At Malmö and Copenhagen the Burgomasters eventually adopted Wullenwever's views, and both peasants and artisans in Denmark were excited and discontented. The expulsion of the old King Christian had been in the main an aristocratic revolution,

abetted by Lübeck in revenge for Christian's attacks on her mercantile monopoly; and the rule of Frederick I had been marked by aristocratic infringements of the commercial privileges of the townsfolk and by oppression of the peasants. Both classes were ready to rise for their old *Bauernkönig*; and Lübeck, aware that Christian would be a puppet in her hands, determined to restore the sovereign whom ten years before she had deposed. The town took into its service Count Christopher of Oldenburg, a competent soldier, albeit a canon of Cologne, and stipulated in case of success for the cession of Gothland, Helsingborg, and Helsingör. In May, 1534, Christopher arrived at Lübeck, and, having won a few trifling successes over Duke Christian, he put to sea with a powerful fleet and appeared off Copenhagen in June. Everywhere almost popular insurrections broke out in favour of the old King or against the ruling nobility. This war was called the *Grevefeide*, and it was in the name of the "Peasant King" that Christopher summoned the town and county proletariate to rise against their lords. Seeland, Copenhagen, Laaland, Langeland, and Falster once more recognised him as their sovereign; revolts of the peasants in Fünen and Jutland led to a similar recognition, while Oldendorp, whom Wullenwever describes as the originator of the movement, roused some of the Swedish cities. The Lubeck revolutionists seemed to be carrying all before them; democratic factions triumphed at Stralsund, Rostock, Riga, and Reval, and sent contributions in men or money to the common cause. In Lubeck itself Wullenwever strengthened his position by expelling the hostile minority from the Council, and Bonnus, the Lutheran superintendent, resigned his charge. "Had the cities succeeded as they hoped," wrote a Pomeranian chronicler, "not a Prince or a noble would have been left."

The revolution at Munster was now at its height, and the Princes and nobles were aware of their peril; but the Wurttemberg war also was raging, and they were compelled to content themselves with denouncing the action of Lübeck, leaving to Duke Christian the task of effective resistance. He proved equal to the occasion. In September he completely blockaded the mouth of the Trave and cut off Lubeck from communication with the sea. The city was compelled to restore all the territory it had taken from Holstein, but both parties were left free to carry on hostilities in Denmark. There the Estates, threatened by internal revolts and external foes, had elected Duke Christian King, and in December he captured Aalborg and pacified Jutland. He was helped by contingents from three Princes connected with him by marriage, the Dukes of Prussia and Pomerania and Gustavus of Sweden, whose throne had been offered by Lubeck to Albrecht of Mecklenburg. Near Assens in Fünen on June 11, 1535, Christian's general, Johann Rantzau, defeated the Lübeck allies under Count Johann von Hoya, and almost simultaneously his fleet, commanded by the Danish admiral Skram, won a less decisive victory over the ships of Lubeck off Bornholm. Funen

and Seeland submitted, and in August Copenhagen and Malmö alone held out.

These disasters were fatal to Wullenwever's power in Lübeck; during his absence in Mecklenburg the restoration of the conservatives was effected in August. Wullenwever eventually fell into the hands of the Archbishop of Bremen, was delivered to the Archbishop's brother, Duke Henry of Brunswick, and put to death in September, 1537. With the ruin of his party the prosecution of his war began to languish, and in 1536 Christian took possession of Copenhagen and made himself master of the two kingdoms of Denmark and Norway. He was crowned by the Lutheran apostle Bugenhagen, under whose auspices religion according to the straitest sect of Wittenberg was established in Denmark. Christian's triumph was no doubt largely due to national antipathy to the domineering interference of an alien State, but the national feeling was exploited by class prejudice, and the aristocracy in Denmark turned their victory to the same use as the German Princes did theirs in the Peasants' War. In both cases Lutheranism made common cause with the upper classes; the proclamation of the Gospel and the enforcement of serfdom went hand in hand, but the landlord was the predominant partner, and even the children of preachers remained in the status of serfs.

To Lubeck itself it is possible that the success of Wullenwever's grandiose ideas of mercantile empire might have been more fatal than their failure. According to Baltic nautical ballads Lübeck long regretted its turbulent Burgomaster, and his name is surrounded in popular legend with something of the halo of a van Artevelde, but his attempt to clothe the new democratic spirit in the worn-out garb of the city-empire was doomed from the first to end in disaster. He could not have permanently averted the decay of the Hanse towns or prevented the absorption of most of them in the growing territorial States; temporary success would only have prolonged the struggle without affecting the last result. Besides the local circumstances which would have rendered ineffectual the endeavour of Lübeck, under whatever form of municipal government it might have been made, to establish an imperial State, there was no element of stability in the revolutionary spirit of which that endeavour was the last manifestation. The future of Germany was bound up with the fortunes of the territorial principle, and it is impossible to determine exactly in what degree the Lutheran Reformation owed its salvation to its own inherent vitality, and in what to its alliance with the prevailing political organisation. Together Lutheranism and territorialism had crushed the revolutionary movement, whether it took the form of agrarian socialism, Munster Anabaptism, or urban democracy. From the conflict of creeds all but two had now been eliminated, Catholicism and Lutheranism; both were equally linked with the territorial principle, and, whichever prevailed, the political texture of Germany would still be the same. The subsidence

of the revolutionary spirit narrowed the field of contention, and the question became merely one of fixing the limits of this or that territorial State and of locating the frontier between the two established forms of religion.

Yet peace was not any nearer because the rivals had beaten a common foe. The agreement of Nürnberg in 1532 had guaranteed to the members of the Schmalkaldic League immunity for their religion, but it did not define religion or provide security for future Protestants. At the Peace of Cadan in 1534 the first point was settled by Ferdinand's quashing all the processes in the *Reichskammergericht* against the Schmalkaldic allies; but the protection did not extend beyond the members of the League, and numerous other Protestant States were liable to practical ruin as the result of the Supreme Court's verdicts. This was a particularly dangerous cause of friction, because Catholic Princes had other than religious motives for executing the judgments of the Court against their Protestant neighbours; as executors of the Court's decrees they could legally seize the lands of recalcitrant cities or lords, and under the guise of religion extend their territorial power. Thus, Duke Eric of Brunswick-Calenberg was anxious to execute sentence on his chief town, Hanover, where a revolutionary movement had taken place; the Duke of Bavaria cast longing eyes on Augsburg; and the specific object of the Catholic League of Halle (1533) was to secure the execution of verdicts against all cities and Princes who were not among the Schmalkaldic confederates. The Catholics undoubtedly had the law on their side, but necessity drove their opponents to break it. They could hardly stand by while their fellow-countrymen were punished for holding the faith they held themselves; had they done so they would only have prepared the way for their own destruction. The obvious method of protecting their co-religionists was to admit them to the Schmalkaldic League; but this was an infraction of the terms of the Nurnberg Peace which would endanger their own security, and they would not have ventured on the step unless circumstances had tied the hands of the Austrian government.

Throughout the greater part of 1535 Charles V was engaged in the conquest of Tunis, and he was hoping to follow up his success in this direction with an attack on the Turks, who were embroiled in a war with Persia, when his plans were disconcerted by the hostile attitude of France. Francesco Sforza, Duke of Milan, died in 1535 without issue, and Francis I, fearing with good reason that Charles would seize the duchy himself, revived his claims to Milan, Genoa, and Asti. In the spring of 1536 he overran Savoy, which had become the Emperor's ally, entered into negotiations with the Turks and with Henry VIII for a joint action against the Habsburgs, and approached the Lutheran Princes with a similar object. The Lutherans were reluctant to side with the Emperor's enemies, but they had no hesitation in putting a high price on their friendship, and in turning Charles' necessities to

account by demanding security for the threatened members of tl Church. In December, 1535, at a diet of the Schmalkaldic Leag they undertook to admit all who would subscribe to the Confession Augsburg; and Württemberg, Pomerania, Anhalt, and the cities Augsburg, Frankfort, Hanover, and Kempten became thus entitled its protection. They renewed their repudiation of the *Reichskamn gericht* as a partisan body, and declared that conscience would not al them to respect its verdicts. They refused in fact to yield to national and imperial authorities that obedience in religious mat which they rigorously exacted from the subjects of their own territo jurisdiction; and at the moment when they were pleading conscience a justification of their own conduct they declined to admit its valic when urged by their Catholic brethren.

The Lutherans had not remained untainted by the pride of po and the arrogance of success. In Ferdinand's own dominions at time Faber declared that but for him and the King all Vienna wo have turned Lutheran, and that it needed but a sign to arm all Germ against the Roman Church. Ferdinand himself was urging such c cessions as the marriage of the clergy and communion under both ki and complained to the Papal Nuncio that he could not find a confe who was not a fornicator, a drunkard, or an ignoramus. In Engl Lutheranism had reached its highest water-mark in Henry's rei Melanchthon had dedicated an edition of his *Loci Communes* to the Tu King, and was willing to undertake a voyage to England to reform English Church. Francis I had invited Melanchthon and Bucer France to discuss the religious situation. The new Pope, Paul III, had succeeded Clement VII in 1534, began his pontificate by creat a number of reforming Cardinals, and sent Vergerio to Germany investigate the possibilities of a concordat with the heretics and ascertain the terms upon which they would support a General Cou In all the Scandinavian kingdoms the triumph of the new faith complete, and the Protestant seemed to be the winning cause in Eur Now, when Charles was threatened with a joint attack by Turks French, it was no time to throw the Lutheran Princes into the ene arms. For the moment temporal security was a more urgent need t the maintenance of the Catholic Church, and the suspension of all ecclesiastical cases in the *Reichskammergericht* was the price w Ferdinand paid for the Lutheran rejection of alliance with Henry and Francis I.

One of Ferdinand's motives was fear lest Bavaria should, by execu the judicial sentence against Augsburg, acquire predominant influenc that important city; and he was by no means averse from the p proposed by the Elector John Frederick of Saxony, of persuac Zwinglian Augsburg to adopt the Lutheran Confession and of t admitting it to the Schmalkaldic League. Augsburg was thus sa

from what Ferdinand regarded as a more pernicious form of heresy than Lutheranism, and also from the clutches of the rival House of Wittelsbach. The way for this conversion was prepared by the Wittenberg Concord of 1536. The hostility between the Zwinglian and Lutheran sects had to some extent subsided since Zwingli's death. Melanchthon had modified his attitude towards predestination, and had been much impressed by Oecolampadius' treatise on the use of the Eucharist during the first three centuries. Luther even brought himself to entertain a friendly feeling for Zwingli's successor Bullinger. After various preliminary negotiations, in which Bucer was as usual the leading spirit, a conference between Luther and representatives of the modified Zwinglianism which prevailed in the cities of Upper Germany was held in Luther's house at Wittenberg in May, 1536. The two parties agreed on a form of words which covered their differences about the real presence in the Eucharist; they were not so successful with regard to the other disputed point, the reception of the body of Christ by unworthy communicants, but they agreed to differ. Luther expressed himself willing to bury the past and roll the stone upon it, and extended to Bucer and the Upper German cities that "brotherly love" which he had refused to Zwingli at Marburg in 1529.

The Concord of Wittenberg only stopped for a while the rifts which had begun to appear in the Schmalkaldic Union. The mere fact of security would have tended to relax the bonds, and there were personal as well as religious differences between John Frederick and Philip of Hesse. Philip expressed contempt for the dull but honest Elector, while John Frederick had grave doubts about Philip's orthodoxy and the morality of his policy. Philip had always inclined to Zwinglian views and resented dictation from Wittenberg; and the two religious parties had nearly come to an open breach over the reformation of Wurttemberg. Ulrich himself was more Zwinglian than Lutheran, and his duchy was partitioned into two spheres of influence, in one of which the Lutheran Schnepf laboured and in the other the Zwinglian Blarer. The latter proved the stronger, and in 1537 Blarer procured the abolition of images in spite of the opposition of Schnepf and Brenz, while Ulrich devoted the confiscated Church revenues to exclusively secular purposes. It seemed as though Hesse, Wurttemberg, and the Oberland cities might form a strong Zwinglian Union independent of the Lutheran League of Schmalkalden. Both the Elector and the Landgrave were hesitating whether to renew that League, and both were pursuing independent negotiations at the Court of Vienna, where Ferdinand by his conciliatory demeanour and concessions induced them both to turn a deaf ear to the persuasions of the Habsburgs' foreign enemies.

The necessity for this pacific diplomacy on Ferdinand's part was amply demonstrated by the course of the war with the French and the Turks from 1536 to 1538. In spite of the neutrality of Henry VIII

and the Lutheran Princes Francis I more than held his own, and the ten years' truce negotiated by Paul III at Nice in 1538 marked a considerable recovery from the humiliation of 1525-9. The real import of the agreement between the two great Catholic Powers, which followed at Aigues-Mortes, was and is a matter of doubt. Ostensibly the alliance was to be directed against infidels and heretics; and Henry VIII, the Lutheran Princes, and the Turks had all some ground for alarm. Even if war was not intended the Lutherans dreaded the General Council which peace brought perceptibly nearer. They had brusquely declined to concur in the assembly vainly summoned by Paul to meet at Mantua in May, 1537, because the terms of the summons implied that its object was the extirpation of Lutherans and not of abuses. They justified their refusal to the Emperor by arguing that the proposed Papal Council was very different from that General Council contemplated by the Diets of 1523 and 1524; and the Elector John Frederick suggested a counter ecumenical council to be held at Augsburg under the protection of the Schmalkaldic League. One and all they denied the Pope's authority to summon a Council and read with delight Henry VIII's manifesto to that effect.

Apart from the General Council which the union of Paul, Charles, and Francis seemed to portend, the Lutherans had been thrown into alarm by the mission to Germany of the Emperor's Vice-Chancellor, Held, who had received his instructions in October, 1536. Held had been a zealous member of the *Reichskammergericht*, and he was burning to avenge the contumely with which Protestants had treated the verdicts of that Court. He interpreted Charles' cautious and somewhat ambiguous language as an order to form a Catholic League with the object of restraining, if not of attacking, the Lutheran Princes. He ignored the Treaty of Cadan and Ferdinand's later concessions, required that the Protestants should promise submission to the proposed Council and to the *Kammergericht*, and, when they refused, proceeded to build up his Catholic alliance. The Habsburg rulers, Ferdinand and the Queen-Regent of the Netherlands, were alarmed at Held's proceedings, but the King could not afford to break with the ultra-Catholics whose tool Held was; and on June 10, 1538, the League of Nürnberg was formed under the nominal patronage of Charles V. Its organisation was a faithful copy of that of the Schmalkaldic League, and its members were the Emperor, the King, the Archbishops of Mainz and Salzburg, and the Dukes of Bavaria, George of Saxony, and Eric and Henry of Brunswick. The League was professedly defensive, but its determination to execute the decrees of the *Kammergericht*, which the Schmalkaldic League had repudiated, really threatened war; and the occasion for it was almost provided by Duke Henry of Brunswick. He was chafing at the support given by the Schmalkaldic League to his two towns of Brunswick and Goslar, which had been condemned by the *Kammergericht* to restore the confiscated goods of the Church; and with a view to consolidating his

territorial power he was eager to carry out the verdict of the Court. Personal animosity between him and his neighbour the Landgrave added fuel to the flames; Philip was believed to be arming for war in the spring of 1539, and Held and Duke Henry were bent upon anticipating his attack.

Such a development was, however, repugnant to responsible people on both sides. The Emperor had not in fact been so truculent as Held represented; his real intention in sending his Vice-Chancellor to Germany seems to have been to provide safeguards for his imperial authority, which in 1536-7 was threatened at least as much by Catholic as it was by Protestant enmities. The Pope appeared to be indifferent to the fate of the Church and Empire in Germany, and regarded with apparent unconcern the alliance between France and the infidels against the Christian Emperor. If Charles was to make head against them he must feel more secure in Germany, and the only means feasible were a Council summoned without the concurrence of Francis or Paul, a national synod of the German people, or a perpetual compromise on the basis of the Nürnberg peace of 1532. The ten years' truce with France concluded at Nice relieved Charles of his more pressing anxieties, but in spite of appearances, brought him no nearer to the position from which he could dictate terms to the Lutherans. He was doubtless aware that Francis had given, both before and after the truce, satisfactory assurances to the German Princes to the effect that the concord was merely defensive and that he would not allow Charles to destroy them. And other dangers arose on the imperial horizon. In February, 1538, Ferdinand closed his long rivalry with Zapolya by a treaty which guaranteed to that potentate, who was then childless, a lifelong tenure of his Hungarian throne on condition that Ferdinand should be his successor. But this only enraged the really formidable foe, the Sultan, who regarded Hungary as his and Zapolya as only his viceroy; and in 1539 war was once more threatened on the banks of the Danube.

A still greater trouble menaced the Habsburgs in Flanders, and the revolt of Ghent extending though it did to Alost, Oudenaarde, and Courtrai, was only a part of the peril. Gelders, which had constantly been to the Burgundian House what Scotland was to England, passed in 1539 into the hands of a ruler who dreamt of uniting with the Schmalkaldic League on the east, with Henry VIII on the west, and possibly with Francis I on the south, and of thus surrounding Charles' dominions in the Netherlands with an impenetrable hostile fence. John, Duke of Cleves, had married Mary, the only child of William of Jülich and Berg; his son William, heir to the united duchy of Cleves-Jülich-Berg, had also claims on the neighbouring duchy of Gelders, whose Duke died without issue in 1538. The Estates of Gelders admitted William's claims, and in February, 1539, he also succeeded his father in Cleves. He had been educated by Erasmus' friend Conrad Heresbach, and the

form of religion obtaining in Cleves was a curious Erasmian compromi between Popery and Protestantism, which erected the Duke into a so of territorial Pope and bore some resemblance to the *via media* pursu by Henry VIII in England and by Joachim II in Brandenburg. Clev was thus a convenient political and theological link between Englan and the Schmalkaldic League; and by means of it Cromwell in 15 thought of forging a chain to bind the Emperor. Duke William sister Sibylla was already married to the Elector Frederick of Saxon and at the end of 1539 another sister Anne was wedded to Henry VII

Over and above these foreign complications the ever-increasin strength of the Lutheran party in Germany rendered an attack upo them a foolhardy enterprise on the Emperor's part unless his hand were completely free in other directions. In 1539 two of the chie pillars of the Catholic Church in the Empire were removed, the Electo of Brandenburg and Duke George of Saxony. Joachim I of Brandenbur had died in 1535, but it was four years later before his son and successo definitely seceded from the ancient Church. On his accession he joine the Catholic League of Halle and retained the old Church ritual, bu in 1538 he refused adherence to the extended Catholic confederation o Nürnberg. In February, 1539, his capital Berlin with Kölln demande the administration of the Sacrament in both kinds, and the Bishop o Brandenburg himself advocated a Reformation. Joachim II, however taking Henry VIII as his exemplar, resolved to be as independent o Wittenberg as he was of Rome; and probably the chief motive in hi Reformation was the facility it afforded him of self-aggrandisement b appropriating the wealth of the monasteries and establishing an absolut control over his Bishops. He became, in fact, though not in title *summus episcopus* and supreme head of the Church within his dominions Like the Tudor King he was fond of splendour and ritual, made fe changes in Catholic use, and maintained an intermediate attitud between the two great religious parties.

The revolution in Albertine Saxony was more complete. Duk George, one of the most estimable Princes of his age, had kept intac his faith in Catholic dogma, though he had spoken with candour of th necessity for practical reforms. On his death in 1539 the Duchy passe to his brother Henry, who had preferred the religion of his Ernestin cousin the Elector to that of his brother the Duke. In order to aver the impending conversion of his duchy, George had made his brother' succession conditional upon his renouncing Lutheranism and joining th League of Nurnberg; if he rejected these terms the duchy was to pass t the Emperor or to Ferdinand. For this violent expedient there wa no legal justification and no practical support within or without th duchy. The people had long resented the repressive measures wit which Duke George had been compelled to support Catholicism, an they accepted with little demur the new Duke and the new religion

One Bishop, John of Meissen, petitioned Charles to be freed from his allegiance to the Duke; but even the Catholic members of the Estates repudiated his action, and in 1540 the Estates sanctioned the Lutheran Reformation which Duke Henry had begun without their concurrence.

Besides the Elector of Brandenburg and the Duke of Saxony, minor Princes and many towns threw in their lot with the Protestant cause. Joachim II's brother, Margrave John of Brandenburg, who ruled in Cottbus and Peitz, joined the Schmalkaldic League in 1537. Ratisbon, long a Catholic stronghold, relinquished its ancient faith; its monasteries had only one or two inmates apiece; and only some twenty people gathered to worship in its cathedral. In other Catholic States there were said to be more monasteries than monks, and the number of candidates for ordination sank to five in four years in the see of Passau, and to seventeen in eight years in that of Laibach. Heidelberg, the Elector Palatine's capital, was described as the most Lutheran city in Germany; and the Elector himself was, in the few moments he spared from the hunt and his cups, wavering between Luther and the Pope. Albrecht of Brandenburg, Luther's "devil of Mainz," was the only member of his family who remained Catholic, and he was compelled to flee from his palace at Halle. Mecklenburg-Schwerin was reformed by its episcopal Duke, and Brunswick-Calenberg by its Dowager-Duchess, Elizabeth of Brandenburg.

So the golden opportunity which the alliance with Paul and Francis at Nice appeared to afford to Charles for the reduction of German heresy passed away through no fault of the Emperor's. The zealous Held was suppressed; the negotiations with the Lutherans were entrusted to the moderate Archbishop of Lund, who had contrived the agreement between Zapolya and Ferdinand; and Charles accepted the mediation of the doubtful Catholic, the Elector Palatine Ludwig V, and the doubtful Protestant, Joachim II of Brandenburg. The parties met at Frankfort in April, 1539. Henry VIII sent envoys to stiffen the Lutheran demands and prevent an agreement if possible. The Protestant terms were high; they wanted a permanent peace which no Council and no assembly of Estates should have the power to break; the Nurnberg League was to receive no fresh accessions, its Protestant rival of Schmalkalden as many as chose to join it; and all processes in the *Reichskammergericht* were to be suspended for eighteen months. All that Charles ultimately conceded was a suspension for six months, and he quietly gave his consent to the Nürnberg League. But its immediate object of enforcing the decrees of the Supreme Court was baulked; and for half a year even the latest recruits to Protestantism were to enjoy complete immunity. Beyond that nothing was settled, and the peace of the Lutherans depended upon the extent of the Emperor's troubles in other directions.

At first the Emperor prospered. Ghent was crushed with ease in February, 1540. As soon as Henry VIII realised that the Catholic

alliance of France, the Pope, and the Emperor, involved no attack upon him, he repudiated his Low German connexions and his plain wife from Cleves, and Charles' ministers marvelled at the ways of Providence. They succeeded also in keeping Philip of Hesse in good humour and in preventing Duke William's admission into the Schmalkaldic League. The clear-sighted Bucer deplored the Emperor's good fortune, and augured the same treatment for Protestant Germany which Charles had meted out to Ghent. But the hour was not yet come. In July, 1540, Francis I rejected the Emperor's conditions for the settlement of their disputes, betrothed his niece, Jeanne of Navarre, to Duke William of Cleves, and refused to surrender his claims on Milan and Savoy, or to join in action against Turk or heretic. Parties in Germany were more confounded than ever. The spread of Lutheranism produced no union in the Catholic ranks, and at Frankfort Catholics as well as Lutherans had refused to serve against the Turks. Charles appears to have reached the not unreasonable conclusion that Catholicism, especially in the ecclesiastical principalities, would only be safe under the shadow of his territorial power. The Electors of Trier, Cologne, and Mainz, and other great Bishops, were ever being tempted to follow the example of Albrecht of Prussia and turn the lands of their sees into secular hereditary fiefs. Bucer had suggested this measure as necessary for the firm foundation of Protestantism, and the Elector of Cologne was beginning to waver. But these non-heritable ecclesiastical fiefs were the chief bulwark of Habsburg imperialism against the encroaching territorial tide; and it was natural that Charles should dream of extending his influence from Burgundy over Cologne, Munster, Bremen, and Osnabruck, so that if they were to be secularised at all, he might do the work and deal with them as he had dealt with Utrecht. This, of course, was not the view of the ecclesiastical Princes, who wished at least to choose between the advantages of their independent spiritual rule and those of an equally independent territorial authority; and there was actually talk of an alliance between them, backed by the Bavarian Dukes, and the Schmalkaldic League, for the defence of national freedom against the Habsburgs. Yet at the same time ultra-Catholics were denouncing Charles for his concessions at Frankfort. The Pope censured the Regent Maria and the Archbishop of Lund, and required the Emperor to annul the agreement with the Protestants on pain of being pronounced schismatic; while Cardinal Pole hinted that the Church had more to fear from Charles V than it had from Henry VIII.

For a while the Emperor had to tread delicately, and he took refuge in a series of religious conferences. The first was held at Hagenau in June, 1540, but produced no result. Another met at Worms in November; there were present eleven Catholics and eleven Protestants, but the former included Ludwig of the Palatinate, Joachim of Brandenburg, and William of Cleves, whose Catholicism was not of the Roman

type. For once the Protestants were united, the Catholics divided, and Granvelle, who represented the Emperor, was an astute politician. Morone, the papal Nuncio, was reduced to attempts to create Protestant dissensions over the Eucharist, and to gain time by substituting an interchange of writings for oral debate. The discussions began on January 14, 1541, between Eck and Melanchthon, but the meeting was soon adjourned to the Diet at Ratisbon, where Charles would attend in person. It opened on April 5, and during its course the two parties made their nearest approach to unity. The Reforming movement in Italy had somewhat modified the Catholic view of justification, and Morone's place was taken by the broad-minded Contarini; while on the other side Bucer had drawn up an alluring scheme of comprehension. He, Melanchthon, and Pistorius represented the Protestants; Eck, Pflug, and Gropper the Catholics. Of the latter Eck was the only fighting divine, and both the marriage of priests and the use of the cup were conceded, while an agreement was reached on the doctrine of justification.

Yet the most pertinent comment on Bucer's scheme was Melanchthon's, who compared it to Plato's *Republic*. He and Luther and John Frederick on one side, and Aleander and the Roman theologians on the other, were convinced that no concord was possible between Rome and evangelical Germany. It has been found possible to elaborate formularies which will bear both a Catholic and a Protestant interpretation, but it requires a strong hand and an effective government to compel their acceptance; Charles could not coerce either Wittenberg or Rome; he had neither the will nor the means of Henry VIII and Elizabeth. Bavaria organised an extreme faction among the Bishops and non-Electoral Princes, who revealed their double motives by threatening to seek another Emperor unless Charles afforded them better protection and obtained restitution of their secularised lands. This intrigue proved fatal to the attempt at comprehension and the result of the Diet was to leave parties in much the same state as before. In July, 1541, Charles made a declaration to the Protestants, suggested by Brandenburg, that the Augsburg Confession should be no ground for proceeding against any Prince; that the *Reichskammergericht* should not exclude questions of ecclesiastical property from this guarantee; and that, although for the future monasteries must not be dissolved, they might adopt a "Christian reformation." But this declaration was to remain secret, and at the same time Charles renewed the Catholic League of Nurnberg. He was forced to ignore both Protestant and Catholic disobedience and to conciliate rebels in both the camps.

If this was a defeat for the Emperor, he found compensation elsewhere, and skilfully turned to his own advantage the most discreditable episode in the history of German Protestantism. Philip of Hesse, like most of the Princes and many of the Prelates of his age, was a debauchee; but with his moral laxity he combined, like Henry VIII,

some curious scruples of conscience, and he could not bring himself to take the sacrament while he was unfaithful to his wife. Insuperable antipathy prevented marital relations; continence was out of the question; debauchery endangered his soul. He put his hard case before the heads of the Lutheran Church. They disbelieved in divorce; so did Henry VIII, but they did not possess Henry's talent for discovering proofs that he had never been married to the wife he wished to repudiate; and bigamy, from which the Tudor abstained, appeared the only solution. The same idea had occurred before to Clement VII; a previous Pope had licensed bigamy in the case of Henry IV of Castile; and the Old Testament precedents were familiar to all. Luther, Melanchthon, and Bucer all concurred in approving Philip's second marriage on condition that it remained a secret. The ceremony took place at Rothenburg on March 4, 1540, and the news soon leaked out. Melanchthon quailed before the public odium and nearly died of shame, but Luther wished to brazen the matter out with a lie. "The secret 'yea,'" he wrote, "must for the sake of Christ's Church remain a public 'nay.'" By denying the truth of the rumours he would, he argued, be doing no more than Christ Himself did when He said He knew not the day and the hour of His second coming, and he also alleged the analogy of the confessional; a good confessor must deny in Court all knowledge of what he has learnt in confession.

The moral effect of this revelation upon the Lutheran cause was incalculable. Cranmer wrote from England to his uncle-in-law Osiander of the pain which it caused to the friends of the Reformation and the handle it gave to the enemy. Ferdinand avowed that he had long been inclined to evangelical doctrines, but that this affair had produced a revulsion of feeling. John Frederick and Ulrich of Wurttemberg refused to guarantee Philip immunity for his crime, the legal penalty for which was death; and the Landgrave, seriously alarmed, sought to make his peace with the Habsburgs, and possibly with Rome; as a last resort he felt he could obtain a dispensation from the Pope, who would willingly pay the price for a prodigal son. In the autumn of 1540 he began his negotiations with Granvelle, and on June 13, 1541, concluded his bargain with Charles; he abandoned his relations with England, France, and Cleves, undertook to exclude them all from the Schmalkaldic League, to side with Charles on all political questions, and to recognise Ferdinand as Charles' successor in the Empire. In return he only obtained security against personal attacks; he would not be exempt from the consequences of a general war against Protestants. Philip's son-in-law, Maurice, who succeeded his father Henry as Duke of Albertine Saxony in that year, was included in the arrangement; and Joachim of Brandenburg was induced to promise help against Cleves in return for the confirmation of his church establishment. As the Elector John Frederick could not be induced to abandon his brother-in-law of Cleves,

the Schmalkaldic League was split into two parties pledged to take opposite sides in that all-important question; and the anger of German historians at this "treason" of Philip of Hesse is due not merely to its disastrous effect on Protestantism, but to the fact that it materially contributed to the conquest of Gelders by Charles and to its eventual separation from the Empire. But for Philip of Hesse's bigamy Gelders might to-day be part of Germany and not of Holland.

The pressure of other dangers, however, gave Gelders a two years' respite. The Emperor hurried from the Diet of Ratisbon to attempt the conquest of Algiers, a nest of pirates which was a perpetual menace to his Spanish and Italian possessions; and the disastrous failure of that expedition encouraged Francis I and Solyman to renew their war on the Habsburgs. Zapolya had died on July 23, 1540, but before his death he had been unexpectedly blessed with a son, John Sigismund. His widow and her minister George Martinuzzi, Bishop of Grosswardein, thereupon repudiated the treaty of Grosswardein (1538), by which Ferdinand was to succeed Zapolya, and crowned the infant John Sigismund. Their only hope lay in Solyman, and the Turk had determined to end the nominal independence which Hungary enjoyed under Zapolya. In August, 1541, he captured Buda, turned its church of St Mary into a mosque, and Hungary into a Turkish province. The Diet of Speier (January, 1542) offered substantial levies for the war, but they were ill-equipped and worse commanded by Joachim of Brandenburg. In September the army sat down before Pesth; on the 5th a breach was made, but the storming party failed; and afterwards, wrote Sir Thomas Seymour, who was present, "the soldiers for lack of wages refused to keep watch and ward or to make assault." Two days later the siege was raised; Joachim and his troops returned in disgrace to Germany; and next year Solyman extended his sway over Funfkirchen, Stuhlweissenburg, and Gran.

Misfortune attended the Emperor in the west as well as in the east. Cleves had definitely thrown in its lot with France, and the anti-imperial league was joined by Sweden, Denmark, and Scotland. The French alliance with Turkey was once more brought into play, the Pope was hostile to both the Habsburg brothers, and Henry VIII was still haggling over the price of his friendship. Francis I declared war in 1542, and, although he failed before Perpignan, a Danish-Clevish army under Martin van Rossem defeated the imperialists at Sittard (March 24, 1543), Luxemburg was overrun, and a Franco-Turkish fleet captured Nice.

The Lutheran Princes meanwhile were making the best of their opportunities. In 1541 the Erasmian Pflug was elected Bishop of Naumburg, but John Frederick feared he would join the Nurnberg League; and in spite of Luther's warnings against the violence of his action he forced Amsdorf into the see. Pflug's cause was adopted by

some of the nobles of Meissen, a part of Saxony which was mainly Albertine but to some extent under Ernestine influence. The Catholic Bishop of Meissen naturally sided with Maurice, who had succeeded to his father in 1541, rather than with John Frederick. In 1542 he demurred to the Elector's demand for levies for the Turkish war, and John Frederick without consulting his cousin marched his troops into Wurzen, the property of a collegiate chapter founded by the Bishops of Meissen, and conveniently situated for incorporation in the Elector's dominions. This inflamed the Albertine nobility, and Maurice began to arm. The Landgrave and Luther intervened; a compromise was patched up, and Wurzen was partitioned; but a root of bitterness remained between the cousins, which bore fruit in later years.

One aggression was promptly followed by another. Among the temporal Catholic Princes none of note were left except the Dukes of Bavaria and Duke Henry of Brunswick. Duke Henry (Luther's "*böser Heinz*") was described as the "greatest Papist in all Germany," and he was left alone in the north to face the Schmalkaldic League. He had long been at enmity with Philip of Hesse, and his cruelty towards his wife was almost as great a scandal as the Landgrave's bigamy. In his zeal for his faith or for his house he pronounced Charles' suspension of the verdicts of the *Reichskammergericht* against Brunswick and Goslar to be contrary to the laws of the Empire, and despite the disapprobation of Ferdinand, Granvelle, and Albrecht of Mainz, he proceeded to attack the two towns. The Schmalkaldic League at once armed in their defence; but not satisfied with this the Elector and the Landgrave overran Henry's duchy, Wolfenbuttel alone offering serious resistance (August, 1542). The Duke's territories were sequestered by the League and evangelised by Bugenhagen. Ferdinand had to content himself with the League's assurance that it would carry the war no farther, and with the pretence that it had been waged in defence of Charles' suspending powers. But the sort of respect the Lutherans were willing to pay the imperial authorities was shown by their attitude towards the *Kammergericht.* They obtained admittance to it early in 1542, and thereupon declined to tolerate the presence of any clerical colleagues; but, failing to secure a majority on it, they declared in December that it had no jurisdiction over them or their allies. Encouraged perhaps by the result of the Brunswick war, Duke William of Cleves now abandoned his Erasmian compromise and adopted Lutheranism undefiled. Even more important was the simultaneous conversion of Hermann von Wied, Archbishop and Elector of Cologne, whose territories were surrounded on all sides by the composite duchy of Cleves-Julich-Berg. Bishop Hermann had held the see since 1515; he had corresponded with Erasmus, and after 1536 had endeavoured to reform the worst practical abuses in his diocese. Gropper's treatise, written to reconcile justification by faith with Catholic doctrine, probably indicates the direction in which the Archbishop's mind

was moving. He next began to correspond with Bucer, who with his connivance commenced preaching at Bonn in 1542. Bucer was followed by Melanchthon, who completed the work of conversion. Franz von Waldeck, Bishop of Munster, Minden, and Osnabruck, was inclined to follow his metropolitan's lead, and another important convert was Count Otto Henry, nephew, and eventually successor, of the Elector Palatine.

The Emperor's fate trembled in the balance. Arrayed against him were France, Turkey, the Pope, Sweden, Denmark, Scotland, Gelders, and Cleves; he could only look for assistance from Henry VIII and the Lutherans. Henry became his ally in hope of reducing Scotland, but into which scale would the German sword be cast? Francis I was holding out all sorts of inducements, and his proposals were backed by Strassburg and Calvin. But the Princes were perhaps not bold enough, perhaps not bad enough, to seize the opportunity of effecting their sovereign's ruin. Francis was allied to both Turk and Pope; Charles was for once maintaining the national cause. To motives of patriotism was added the private agreement between Charles and the Landgrave. The Habsburgs were lavishing all their wiles on Philip; and Philip, in spite of Bucer's warnings and in spite of his own real convictions, allowed himself to be duped. He opposed the admission of Denmark, Sweden, and Cleves into the Schmalkaldic League, and Duke William was thus left to his fate With genuine insight Charles made the reduction of Gelders his first object. On August 22, 1543, he arrived before Duren, the principal stronghold in Gelders; on the 24th it was battered from break of day till 2 p.m, and then his Spanish and Italian troops took it by storm. Julich, Roermonde, and Orkelen fell in the next few days, and on September 6 Duke William knelt before Charles at Venloo. Gelders and Zutphen were annexed to the Emperor's hereditary States, passed from him to Philip II, and thus were in effect severed from the Empire; Duke William repudiated his French bride and his heresy, and later (1546) was married to Maria, Ferdinand's daughter. The Reformation in neighbouring Cologne was checked, and during the winter Bucer declared that the subjection of Germany was inevitable and imminent.

Such was not the view taken by German Princes. Charles still needed their help to deal with France and the Turks, and they allowed themselves to be bought. Their price was heavy, but the Emperor was willing to pay it, knowing that if he succeeded he would get his money back with plenty of interest. At the Diet of Speier in February, 1544, his words were smooth and his promises ample. In fact he almost abandoned the Catholic position by committing himself to the pledge of a national settlement of the religious question whether the Pope liked it or not, and by confirming the suspension of all processes against the Protestants and their possession of the goods of the Church. In return the Lutheran Princes contributed some meagre levies for the French

and Turkish wars. Their real concession was abstention from taking part with the Emperor's enemies, while Charles and Henry VIII invaded the French King's dominions. This time it was John Frederick who made private terms with the Habsburgs without his colleagues' knowledge. In [illegible] for an imperial guarantee of the Cleves succession to his wife, th[illegible] of Duke William, in case William's line died out, the Elector of S[illegible]y recognised Ferdinand as Roman King; and the compact was to be sealed by the marriage of John Frederick's son to one of Ferdinand's daughters. Other members of the hostile coalition were detached by the same skilful play upon particularist interests. Gustavus of Sweden and Frederick of Denmark had joined it from fear lest Charles should enforce the claims of his niece Dorothea (daughter of Christian II and Isabella), and her husband, Count Frederick of the Palatinate, to both those kingdoms. These were now abandoned and Francis I was left without allies except the Pope and the Sultan.

The campaign opened in 1544 with a French victory at Ceresole, but the tables were turned in the north. Aided by Lutheran troops Charles captured St Dizier while Henry VIII laid siege to Boulogne. In September the Emperor was almost within sight of the walls of Paris, when suddenly on the 18th he signed the preliminaries of the Peace of Crépy. Many and ingenious were the reasons alleged before the world and to his ally of England. In reality there had been a race between the two as to which should make peace first and leave the other in the grip of the enemy. Had Henry won he might have conquered Scotland, and there might have been no Schmalkaldic war. But Charles had proved the nimbler; it was he and not Henry who was left free to deliver his blows in another direction. At the cost of liberal terms to his foe he had duped one of the allies who had helped him to victory; it remains to recount the fate which befell the other.

CHAPTER VIII.

RELIGIOUS WAR IN GERMANY.

Charles V achieved a masterpiece of unscrupulous statecraft when he extricated himself from his war with France and left his English ally entangled in its toils. Cogent military reasons for the peace concluded at Crépy could doubtless be alleged; the position of the imperial army in the heart of France was more imposing than secure, and the disasters of the retreat from Marseilles in 1524 might have been repeated in Champagne or Picardy. But there were deeper motives at work; however promising the military situation might have been, no prosecution of the war could have been attended with greater advantages than was its conclusion at that juncture. Charles was left with a freer hand to deal with Germany than he had ever had before. He had been more brilliantly victorious in 1530, but England and France were then at peace, and at liberty to harass him with underhand intrigues. Now, they were anxious suitors for his favour, ready, instead of reluctant, to purchase his support against each other by furthering the Emperor's efforts to cope with his remaining difficulties. These were now three, Turkish, Lutheran, and papal; with the two latter he must deal to some extent simultaneously; the Turkish problem he was enabled by the friendly offices of Francis I to postpone.

Few historical points are so hard to determine as Charles' real intentions with respect to the religious situation in Germany in 1545. Was it to be peace or was it to be war? We have much of the Emperor's correspondence to guide us, but its help is by no means decisive. Charles was constitutionally hesitating; it was his habit to dally with rival schemes until circumstances compelled a choice. On the eve of war he was still weighing the merits of peace, and it was always possible that an unexpected development in any one of his heterogeneous realms might disturb all past calculations. Yet there can be little doubt as to Charles' ultimate aim in 1545 or at any other date. The original dynastic objects of his policy had been achieved with wonderful success, and the subordinate but still powerful motive of religion came more prominently into action. His religious ideas

were comparatively simple; he adhered to medieval Catholicism because he could comprehend no other creed and conceive of no other form of ecclesiastical polity. As well let there be two Emperors as two independent standards of faith. The Church like the Empire must be [illegible] indivisible, and he must be the sovereign of the one and the [illegible] of the other.

[illegible] these ideas it was impossible for Charles even to contemplate a permanent toleration of schism or heresy. His concessions to the Lutherans from 1526 to 1544 were not made with any such intention; they were simply payments extorted from Charles by necessity for indispensable services to be rendered against the Turks and the French; they were all provisional and were limited in time to the meeting of a General Council. That they sprang from necessity and not from any reluctance of Charles to persecute is proved by his conduct in other lands than Germany. He did not attempt a policy of toleration or comprehension in Spain or in the Netherlands; there his methods were the Inquisition and the stake. Wherever he had the power to persecute he persecuted; he abstained in Germany only because he had no other choice and because he thought his abstention was not for ever; and in the end the most powerful motive for his abdication was his desire to escape the necessity of countenancing permanent schism.

Throughout, Charles was steadfast to the idea of Catholic unity; but his determination to enforce it at the cost of war was the growth of time and the result of the gradual course of events. He is credited with a desire to effect his end by the method of comprehension; but room for the Lutherans in the Catholic Church was to be found not so much by widening the portals of the Church as by narrowing Lutheran doctrine, by the partial submission of the Lutherans and not by the surrender of current Catholicism. It soon became obvious that the Lutherans would never be brought to the point of voluntary submission; and so early as 1531 the Emperor would have resorted to persecution if he had had the means. But from persecution to war was a long step, and he would have shrunk from war at that date even if it had been in his power to wage it. Before 1545, however, this reluctance had been removed. The logic of facts had proved that it was a death-struggle in Germany between the medieval Church and Empire on the one hand and Protestant territorialism on the other. The fault was partly the Emperor's; by making himself the champion of the old religion he had forced an alliance between the anti-Catholic Reformers and the anti-imperial Princes; and from 1532 onwards territorial and Protestant principles had made vast strides at the expense of Catholicism and the Empire. It is not necessary, nor is it possible, to determine which advance alarmed Charles most; both were equally fatal to the position which he had adopted. The threatened secularisation of the ecclesiastical electorates would have converted Germany from a Catholic monarchy

Protestant oligarchy; and such was the meaning of the proposal Lutheran Princes in 1545 to revive the dignity of the Electorate, ›y the evangelisation of Cologne and of the Palatinate they had ed a majority of votes in the Electoral College. Nor was that ly danger. A portion of the Netherlands would naturall[illegible]ow *igious lead of its metropolitan city, Cologne*; the accessi[illegible]e ıate to the Lutheran cause threatened the Habsburg [illegible]in ; and a majority of Protestant Electors might mean a Protestant or at the next vacancy.

ese perils, and the persistency with which the Lutherans turned ıpire's necessities to their own advantage, convinced Charles that ıes at stake were worth the risks of war. He was sure that there › remedy but force, without perhaps being certain that force y remedy. At the same time his experience in Germany from o 1544 had shown him how those risks might be minimised. ındgrave's bigamy had driven a wedge into the Protestant ranks; : success with which the Emperor had widened the breach between ·al Saxony and Hesse had opened the prospect of further ıs among the Lutheran Princes. Charles declares in his *Com-ics* that his success in isolating Cleves proved to him the lack of ıce among his enemies, and made him hope for victory in case of nd that he intended in 1544 if not earlier to make war on the ıns is hardly a matter of doubt. He would not have made such ›ncessions at the Diet of Speier in 1544, had he not foreseen that settlement of accounts with France would enable him to render oncessions nugatory; and the fact that the Lutherans fell so ıto the trap has been considered the most conclusive proof of olitical incapacity. Within three months from the date of the ·ith France Charles was discussing with the Pope details of a war the Lutherans. People would be glad, he wrote, if the Pope ı to that object the vast sums he had amassed for a war against ·ks, "especially if the undertaking against the Turk had ceased to ressing necessity"; he declared that one of his chief objects in ing peace with France was to be able to conduct these two ,ainst Turks and Lutherans successfully; and there was a secret ion that Francis I should assist in his endeavours. The war the Turks had been one of the pretexts for requiring Lutheran the Diet of Speier; but Charles was taking care that it should to be a pressing necessity" or to stand in the way of the other had in his mind.

it would be a mistake to represent a religious war as the r's prime object. It would in any case be only the means to an l he was still seeking if not hoping to attain that end by other He had moreover greater schemes in view than a mere conquest ,utherans. He was, though to a less extent than his grandfather

Maximilian, subject to dreams, and his dream from 1545 to the disasters of 1552 was to assemble a General Council by means of which he would reduce the Lutherans to Catholicism and the Pope to reform; then having united and purified Western Christendom he would march at its head against the Infidel, regain the East for the orthodox faith, and be crowned in Jerusalem. Maximilian had contemplated all these achievements, and had also hoped to encircle his brow with the tiara of a Pope and the halo of a saint; but Charles would have been content to crown his life with monastic retirement. The object immediately under consideration in 1545 was the General Council for which he had laboured so long in vain. By this means he hoped to work his will both with the Pope and with the Protestants. The Lutherans had for many years expressed a desire for a General Council; if it met and they accepted its decrees, unity would be achieved: if they refused to be bound by them, the refusal would be a justification for war and a good ground on which to appeal for help to the Catholic Powers. Secondly, the mere fact of its meeting would annul the concessions which Charles had made; and thirdly, the demand of a free General Council from an obstructive Pope would enhance the illusion under which the Lutherans laboured that Charles was their ally against the Papacy. In August, 1544, Paul III had denounced the Emperor's compliance at Speier, had reminded him of the fate of his predecessors, from Nero to Frederick II, who had persecuted the Church, and had threatened him with an even more terrible doom; and Luther and Calvin had thereupon seized their pens in his defence. The Pope in fact was the chief obstacle to the Council; but the peace between Charles and Francis destroyed all chance of successful resistance; and Paul III made a virtue of necessity by summoning a Council to meet at Trent in March, 1545. As the Edict of Worms had been dated the same day as Charles' alliance with Leo X, so this summons to the Council of Trent followed speedily on the conclusion of the Peace of Crépy.

If Charles hoped for Protestant submission to the Council of Trent he was speedily undeceived. The choice of Trent was a concession to German sentiment, but was nevertheless a δῶρον ἄδωρον. Trent was only nominally a German city; in feeling it was almost purely Italian, and, on account of its proximity to Italy, Italian Bishops would swamp the Council almost as completely as if it had met within Italian borders. The practical exclusion of deputies made the adequate representation of non-Italian sees impossible; and the choice of monastic theologians ruined the prospect of an accommodation with Lutheran doctrine. The authority of the universal Church was assumed by a gathering of Italian and Spanish Bishops, who would unite to maintain the extreme Catholic theology, and would only be divided by the political question of papal or imperial predominance. Even in the more favourable event of Charles prevailing, the Protestants had little to hope; a few practical abuses

might be removed, but the medieval Church would remain in essence the same, and an attempt would be made to force them within its pale. Hence they repudiated the Council from the beginning; they denied that it was free, Christian, or General, the three conditions upon which alone they would recognise its authority; and at the Diet of Worms, which met in the spring of 1545, they demanded from Charles a permanent religious security quite independent of what the Council might decree. Nothing would ever have induced the Emperor to grant such terms, they would have involved him in the sin of schism and cut away the ground on which his whole position and policy were based; the one weapon with which he now hoped to effect his aims would have broken in his hands. So Ferdinand, who represented Charles, unhesitatingly rejected the petition; there was nothing, he truly said, in the decisions of Speier in the previous year to justify it.

War thus became inevitable, but Charles still sought to postpone it. He was not yet sure of peace with the Turks, of the Pope, or of the allies he hoped to win from the Lutheran side. Although the Spaniards at his Court spoke openly of the approaching extirpation of Protestantism, and although his confessor, Domenico de Soto, reinforced by the influence of Peter Canisius and other early missionaries of the Company of Jesus in Germany, was constantly urging him to take the decisive step, Granvelle and even Alva were still for peace, and the Emperor halted between the two opinions. To bring the Pope to terms he again made show of listening to the Lutherans. He expressed his intention of carrying out the decisions of the Diet of Speier, and annoyed the Catholics by again holding out the prospect of a national Council on religion, in case the General Council at Trent proved abortive. To this national assembly was also postponed the consideration of the various projects of reform which had been drawn up as a result of the Diet of Speier. The most notable of them was the "Wittenberg Reformation," which was drawn up by the Elector John Frederick, and signed by Luther, Bugenhagen, Cruciger, and Melanchthon, although it contains few traces of Luther's spirit. It recommended the establishment of a Protestant episcopacy on the ground that Princes were too much immersed in secular affairs to exert a proper supervision over those of the Church; possibly also it was intended to reconcile the great Catholic Bishops to a change of faith.

During 1545, however, the last reasons for hesitation vanished. The Turks, threatened with war in Persia and with a dynastic dispute between Roxolana and Mustapha, listened to the mediation of Francis I, and concluded a truce with Charles and Ferdinand in October. The Emperor had nothing to fear from the Kings of France and England, who were then engaged in a bitter war; and Christian III of Denmark had been alienated by the Schmalkaldic League's refusal to assist him in 1544, and alarmed by the admission into it of the Elector Palatine,

who had claims to the Danish throne through his wife Dorothea, Christian II's daughter. The Council of Trent actually met in December, and Paul III offered 12,000 foot, 500 horse, a loan of 200,000 crowns and half-a-year's ecclesiastical revenues in Spain for the purposes of the war. At the same time the Emperor's personal efforts to check the Reformation in Cologne had failed; Hermann von Wied defied both the imperial Ban and the papal Bull, and was taken under the wing of the Schmalkaldic League. The primate, Albrecht of Mainz, died in September; Charles' candidate for the vacant Archbishopric received not a single vote; and Sebastian von Heusenstamm was an Erasmian Catholic who owed his election to Philip of Hesse's aid rendered in return for Heusenstamm's promise to purify his see. Duke Henry of Brunswick was defeated in an attempt in September to regain his duchy with the help of mercenaries under Christopher von Wrisberg; the sequestration of his territories arranged at Speier and Worms was set aside; and they were appropriated by the Schmalkaldic League, an act of violence which Charles expressed his intention of using as a pretext for a religious war.

In these circumstances the doctrinal discussions which the Emperor renewed in the winter can be regarded as little more than a blind to delude the Protestants or a screen behind which he made his preparations for war. His representatives at the conference, Cochlaeus, Eberhard Billick, and Malvenda all held extreme views, and their arguments were principally aimed against the compromise of 1541. They revived the scholastic dogmas which had then been abandoned; and the interest of their discussions consists, for English readers at any rate, mainly in the fact that Malvenda based his defence on the teaching of a forgotten English Dominican, Robert Holcot (d. 1349). Charles' real efforts were directed towards the more useful work of consolidating the Catholic and disintegrating the Protestant party. The leading Catholic opponent of the Habsburgs, Duke William III of Bavaria, who ruled the whole duchy since the death of his younger brother Ludwig, was won over to something more than benevolent neutrality by the alliance between Pope and Emperor, by the marriage of his son with Ferdinand's eldest daughter, and a promise of the throne of Bohemia for their descendants if Ferdinand's male issue failed, and by the offer of the coveted hat of the Elector Palatine, if the latter sided openly with Charles' enemies.

Still more important were the divisions among the Protestants. The imprisonment of Duke Henry of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel and the seizure of his duchy had alienated his Protestant as well as his Catholic kinsfolk, including the Duchess Elizabeth of Brunswick-Calenberg, her son Duke Eric, and Duke Henry's son-in-law Margrave Hans of Brandenburg-Cüstrin, who were detached from the Schmalkaldic League by the promise of Henry's restoration. Margrave Hans' elder brother, the Elector Joachim of Brandenburg, was already pledged to neutrality, and

his cousin Margrave Albrecht Alcibiades of Brandenburg-Culmbach was also brought into the Emperor's net. But these accessions of strength were trifling compared with the advantages secured by Charles through the reconciliation of Duke Maurice of Saxony.

Maurice's uncle Duke George (1500–39), the main representative of the Albertine branch of the House of Wettin, had been the staunchest Catholic in the north of Germany; but his father Duke Henry (1539–41) had been a no less zealous Protestant. Maurice, who succeeded to the duchy in 1541, when twenty-one years of age, was neither. The hereditary jealousy between the Albertine and Ernestine Houses of Saxony was neutralised to some extent by Duke Henry's adoption of the Protestant cause and by Maurice's marriage with Agnes, the daughter of Philip of Hesse. But Maurice was less influenced perhaps by religious motives than any other Prince of the age; and he poured scorn on those who thought that the interests of the State should be subordinate to theological dogma. His Protestant education at the Elector John Frederick's Court did not prevent his recalling the Catholic counsellors of his uncle Duke George. He readily followed his father-in-law, Philip of Hesse, in making a compact with Charles in 1541, though he had not Philip's personal motive of fear; and he assisted the Emperor to reduce John Frederick's brother-in-law, Duke William of Cleves. This first aroused enmity between him and the Elector; the dispute concerning the bishoprics of Meissen and Merseburg increased it; and a fresh source of discord arose in the question of the protectorate of the sees of Magdeburg and Halberstadt, which Maurice wanted for himself and declared that John Frederick coveted. Carlowitz, an old adviser of Duke George and a member of one of the noble families of Meissen, which had sided against John Frederick as to the question of the bishopric, was untiring in his efforts to win over Maurice from the Elector's side to that of the Emperor; and the attempts of the Archbishop of Cologne to reconcile the cousins in the summer of 1546 proved futile. Luther had succeeded in allaying their quarrels about Meissen; but Luther was now no more. He passed away on February 18, 1546, full of forebodings of evil to come, and more dominated than ever by wrath against Sacramentaries on the one hand and the Pope on the other; and revenge was taken for his diatribes against Rome by the invention of a legend that the great reformer died by his own hand.

Luther had ample justification for gloomy vaticinations, and the internal weakness of the Schmalkaldic League was doubtless one of Maurice's most powerful motives for refusing to trust his fortunes in so ill-found a vessel. Bucer proposed a dictatorship as the only cure, and Philip of Hesse would naturally be his choice for the office. Maurice, on the other hand, who could not expect to rank above Philip or John Frederick, suggested a triumvirate, and refused Philip's invitation to enter the League as it was then constituted. A prolonged diet of the

League was held at Frankfort from December, 1545, to February, 1546, without resulting in harmony between Philip and John Frederick or in the adoption of satisfactory financial or military preparations for war. Philip had been alarmed early in 1545 by rumours of the approaching peace with the Turks, and wished to send embassies to England, France, and Denmark, to form an alliance with the Swiss and with Holland, and to take the offensive before Charles' measures were complete. But John Frederick believed in peace to the last. He was deluded by Charles' assurances that he meant no war on the Lutherans, but rather another expedition against Algiers, and by the Emperor's apparent confidence in peace, evinced by his crossing Germany almost unattended from the Netherlands to Ratisbon, which base it was in fact essential for Charles to reach.

So the time passed until the opening of the Diet at Ratisbon in June, 1546. Eric of Brunswick, Margrave Hans of Cüstrin, and some other Protestants whom Charles had won over were present; but Philip and John Frederick were absent. Maurice, who was still ostensibly on the best of terms with his cousin and his father-in-law, was told by Granvelle that he must come to Ratisbon to conclude his agreement with the Emperor. Maurice came, but he was determined not to sell himself too cheaply. Besides the grant of the practical administration of Magdeburg and Halberstadt, a demand which ran counter to all the principles Charles was bent on enforcing, he required the transference to himself of his cousin's electoral dignity and—what cost Charles a greater effort to concede—immunity from the decrees of the Council of Trent, so far as they might touch the doctrine of justification by faith, clerical marriages, and communion in both elements. Without these concessions Maurice despaired of maintaining his position in Protestant Saxony, and with some modifications they were all granted by Charles. The Emperor's confessor had advised him to tempt some of the Protestant Princes with the bait of their neighbours' vineyards; but it was a sore test for Charles when, in order to attain his purpose, he had to grant in private to particular Princes terms which he refused to them all in public, and to surrender that principle of submission to the Church on which the whole war was based.

Somewhat similar verbal assurances were made to Hans of Cüstrin, Albrecht of Culmbach, and Eric of Brunswick. On June 7 the treaty with Bavaria was formally signed, and two days later that with the Pope. But the Diet still continued; and on the 13th the Protestants repudiated the Council of Trent and demanded instead a national Council. Pending its decisions the compromise of Speier should remain in force. Charles laughed; he had already given orders for mobilisation. Encouraged by the success of his diplomacy in dividing the Protestants and by the singularly favourable aspect of foreign affairs, urged on by the exhortation of his Spanish subjects, possibly carried away to some extent

by the rising theological temper, of which the murder of an unfortunate Protestant, Juan Diaz, and its official approval, were signs, Charles had taken the plunge, and on May 24 he had announced to his sister Maria his resolve to begin the war of religion.

The Elector of Saxony must have been the only leading Protestant who was surprised by the decision. Philip of Hesse had long been seeking in vain to awake the Schmalkaldic League from its lethargy. But, expected or not, the war certainly found the Protestants unfitted if not unprepared to cope with the crisis. Long immunity had created a false sense of security; and the League, whose military strength appeared imposing, was honeycombed with disaffection. It had not escaped the workings of that particularism which had proved fatal to the Swabian League and to the *Reichsregiment*; and its members were discontented because it could not grind all their private axes. The cities, and still more the knights, were hostile as ever to the encroaching territorial power of the Princes, among whom Philip of Hesse was considered the protagonist. At his door was laid the ruin of Sickingen, and Sickingen's son mustered many a knight to Charles' standard. Charles moreover could appeal to public opinion as the champion of the imperial constitution, which the Lutheran Princes attacked without suggesting a substitute. They had repudiated the *Kammergericht*, protested against the Diet's recesses whenever they pleased, and denied the authority of General Councils and of the Emperor himself; he was no longer Emperor, they said, but a bailiff of the Pope. But if authority were denied to all these institutions, where was the bulwark against anarchy? They might seem to have resolved that the Empire should not exist at all unless it served their particular purpose.

It was this aspect of lawlessness which enabled Charles to pretend that the war was waged, not against any form of religion, but against rebellion. When Hans of Custrin's chaplains were preaching the purest word of Lutheranism within the lines of the Emperor's camp, who could say that Charles was warring on Lutheran doctrine? Henry VIII told the Schmalkaldic envoys that if they were threatened on account of religion he would come to their aid, but he could not see that such was the case when so many Protestant Princes were fighting on Charles' side. The Emperor spared no pains to foster this public impression. On this ground he persuaded the Swiss to remain neutral, and endeavoured to detach the south German towns from the cause of the Princes. He sought, in fact, to isolate Philip and John Frederick as he had isolated William of Cleves in 1543, and to represent his offence and theirs as the same. In the ban which was proclaimed against them on July 20 he recalled the Pack conspiracy of 1528, the invasion of Wurttemberg in 1534, and the two wars in Brunswick; and held up the Princes to reprobation as contemners of public authority and disturbers of the peace of the Empire.

And yet Paul III was declaring at the same moment that the war was due to injuries done to the Church and to the Princes' refusal to acknowledge the Council of Trent. He sent the cross to his Legate Alessandro Farnese, and offered indulgences to all who assisted in the extirpation of heresy. In his eyes at least the war was a crusade, and as such he commended it to the Catholic Swiss. The Emperor himself in his private utterances confirmed this view. To his sister he admitted that the charges against Philip and John Frederick were a pretext intended to disguise the real issue of the war. To his son he wrote that his intention had been and was to wage war in defence of religion, and that the public declarations about punishing disobedience were only made for the sake of expediency; and when the war was over he told the Diet of Augsburg that the disturbance had originated in religious schism.

There was no irreconcilable contradiction between the two contentions. To repudiate Charles' religion was a civil as well as an ecclesiastical offence, because it was impossible to distinguish in Charles the person of the Emperor from the person of the protector of the Church, just as Henry VIII made it impossible for men to distinguish in him the Supreme Head from the sovereign. Henry utilised the divinity which hedged a king to combat the divinity of Rome; Charles employed the remnants of respect for the imperial authority to extinguish Lutheran doctrine. It was always possible to represent heresy as treason so long as Church and State were but two aspects of one body politic; it was always expedient to do so because the State in the sixteenth century was a more popular institution than the Church; numbers confessed to heresy, but few would confess to treason.

To all these advantages the Schmalkaldic League could oppose in July, 1546, an undoubted superiority of military force. Charles would depend mainly upon troops from the Netherlands, and his own and the papal levies from Spain and Italy. But the whole breadth of Germany separated him from the one and the Alps from the other; and prompt offensive action on the part of the League would have ended the war in a month. Promptness and boldness were, however, the last qualities to be expected from the League. Every question had to be referred by the commanders in the field to the League's council of war, where it was generally made the subject of acrimonious discussion between representatives of the south German cities and the Princes, or between the adherents of the adventurous Philip of Hesse and the sluggish Elector of Saxony. They were afraid to take the offensive lest it should damage their cause in public opinion. In particular they would not violate Bavarian territory, wherein Charles was established at Ratisbon, lest Bavaria should be driven into the Emperor's arms, where as a matter of fact it was already reposing. This timidity ruined their best chance of success. Schärtlin, the ablest of the League's commanders, who led the forces of Ulm and Augsburg, had conceived the bold plan of

marching south-west, and closing the Tyrolese passes against Charles' Spanish and Italian levies. This could probably have been effected without much difficulty, and the Emperor would thus have been rendered powerless in Germany; for the Tyrolese peasantry had sympathies with the Protestant cause, and their experience of Spanish and Italian mercenaries in 1532 made them anxious to keep them at a distance. Schärtlin actually crossed the Danube, seized Füssen and the Ehrenberg pass; but the League based fond hopes upon Ferdinand's conciliatory attitude, and its reluctance to offend him spoilt Schärtlin's plan, as its fear of Bavaria had prevented the proposed seizure of Ingolstadt and march on Ratisbon.

Recalled from the south, Schartlin occupied Donauwörth, a city where the Catholic Fuggers were strong; and here he was joined by the Elector and the Landgrave. The total force now amounted to fifty thousand foot and seven thousand horse, but this formidable army wasted the whole month of August, while Charles advanced to Landshut with little more than six thousand men, and effected a junction with his Italian and Spanish troops. He then moved on to Ingolstadt and threatened to cut the Protestant communications with Upper Swabia, whence they drew their supplies. On the last day of August the two armies were only separated by a few miles of swamp. Philip of Hesse succeeded in planting a hundred and ten guns within range of the imperial camp; but the bombardment failed to compel Charles either to attack or to evacuate, while the Protestants, for reasons which were afterwards disputed between Philip and Schartlin, declined to risk an assault on Charles' entrenchments. The only result was a series of indecisive skirmishes between the light horse of either party; but the Emperor gradually extended his control up the banks of the Danube in the direction of the forces from the Netherlands under van Buren, who crowned a brilliant march across Germany by eluding the main Protestant army and uniting with Charles at Ingolstadt on September 17.

The Emperor could now assume the offensive. The Neumark territories of the Count Palatine Otto Henry, a zealous Protestant, were overrun, and the imperial army made for Nordlingen. The Protestants, however, keeping to the high ground and resisting all Alva's temptations to come down and fight, headed Charles off, and he thereupon turned south-west towards Ulm. Again he was anticipated; Ulm was too strong to be taken by the *camisado* which Charles proposed, and the climate and lack of money began to tell heavily upon his southern troops. Three thousand Italians deserted in one day, and death thinned the Emperor's ranks as fast as desertion. The term during which the papal auxiliaries were bound to serve would expire in the winter, and the Protestants thought the imperial cause would collapse without a battle. But their own difficulties were hardly less than those of Charles. Their German troops were more inured to the climate, but money and

food were equally scarce; and it has been contended that the League's abandonment of southern Germany was due to financial straits, and not to Maurice's attack on John Frederick. The cities were frightened by the loss of their trade; the Protestant lands of the Baltic, the French, and the Swiss showed no disposition to intervene. The Leaguers therefore made proposals of peace; but Charles rejected their terms, refusing to regard them as aught but rebellious vassals.

He had reasons for confidence unknown to the enemy. His diplomacy had in fact made victory certain almost before the war began. On October 27, in his camp at Sontheim, he signed the formal transference of the Saxon Electorate from John Frederick to Maurice, and a few days later Maurice and Ferdinand entered upon the conquest of Ernestine Saxony. The partnership was the result of mutual distrust. Maurice would have held aloof, could he have obtained his ends by peaceful means. But he could not hope for the Electorate unless he won it by arms. Ferdinand was preparing for war in Saxony; and if Maurice remained inactive, he might find himself in as evil a plight as John Frederick, and at the mercy of a victorious Habsburg army. His desire to remain neutral was overcome by force of circumstances; and the most favourable view of his conduct is that in self-defence he was driven to attack his still more defenceless cousin.

However this may be, Maurice had experienced great difficulty in inducing his Lutheran Estates to concur in an attack on his cousin's lands. His preachers had declared that Charles was warring on the Gospel, and that whoever abetted him would incur everlasting damnation. To discount these denunciations Maurice produced a declaration from the Emperor that religion should remain untouched where it was established; he represented to his Estates that if he did not execute the ban against John Frederick, Ferdinand would, and that it would be much safer for them politically and theologically that Electoral Saxony should fall into his Protestant hands than into the Catholic hands of Ferdinand. The counterpart of the argument was employed by Ferdinand to secure the co-operation of his Bohemian nobles; it would, he said, be fatal to Bohemia's claims on Saxon lands if Maurice were to execute the ban alone. So each Prince joined to execute the ban ostensibly as a check upon the other, and they agreed on a partition of the spoils. On October 30 Bohemian troops crossed the Saxon frontier and terrified the neighbouring towns. Maurice undertook to defend them on condition that they did him homage, while he promised to protect their religion and to treat the Elector with every respect consistent with his own obligations to the Emperor. Zwickau, Borna, Altenburg, and Torgau all accepted these terms, and the greater part of the Electorate passed into Maurice's possession.

The news of these events reached the armies on the Danube early in November and exercised a decisive influence over the campaign in southern

Germany. On the 23rd the Protestant army broke up, and Jo Frederick hastened to the defence of his Electorate. The League's p was to leave an army of observation in the south to protect the Protest cities if attacked, and to occupy the Franconian bishoprics while Elector reconquered Saxony. Only the last part of the programme carried out. The departure northwards of the main army was follow by a stampede among the south German cities. The Protestant lig horse went home for want of pay, and the army of observation came nothing. Philip of Hesse failed to raise the peasants and artisans Franconia and practically retired from the contest; while Gieng Nordlingen, and Rothenburg rapidly fell into the Emperor's pow The moment had come for breaking up the disjointed League. T southern cities had never forgotten their Zwinglian leanings or be happy in their political and religious relations with the north Germ princes. They at least had no territorial ambitions to gratify, and Charles could give them security for their religion, there was no reas for them to continue the struggle. Nurnberg, in spite of its stro Lutheranism, had from the first refused to fight. Granvelle, alw peaceably inclined, pressed on Charles the dangers of war, and Emperor himself had not the personal feeling against the cities which exhibited towards the Landgrave and the Elector.

Negotiations were first opened with Ulm, which stood out stron for a religious guarantee, but was ultimately satisfied with a verl promise that it should enjoy the same advantages in that respect Maurice of Saxony and the Hohenzollerns. The agreement was conclud on December 23, and similar terms were soon arranged with Memming Biberach, Heilbronn, Esslingen, and Reutlingen—all of them among t original fourteen Protestant cities of 1529. Frankfort submitted t days before the end of the year, and Augsburg and Strassburg January, 1547. Augsburg was moved by the influence of the big tradi families; Anton Fugger conducted the negotiations; and the city co tented itself with Granvelle's oral promise of religious toleration. Ne came Strassburg, the surrender of which caused Bucer and Jacob Stu some bitter pangs; but the dangerous proximity of the city to Frar and Switzerland induced Charles to offer exceptionally liberal tern The others were all compelled to contribute as much to the Empero war expenses as they had paid to his opponents. By February all t south German cities had yielded with the exception of Constance; a the Protestant Princes of the south could no longer hold out. Charl old friend the Elector Palatine, Frederick II, the lover of his sister a the husband of his niece, and his old enemy, Ulrich of Wurttembe both came to crave his forgiveness. The Elector suffered nothing beyo reproaches; but Ulrich was forced to pay an indemnity of three hundr thousand crowns, to surrender some of his strongest fortresses to perm nent imperial garrisons, and to engage in service against his form

allies. He was fortunate to escape so lightly; he had not learnt wisdom with years, and his people detested his rule. Ferdinand pressed for the abrogation of the Treaty of Cadan and the restitution of the duchy, but Charles was afraid that such a step would revive Bavarian and other jealousies of the Habsburg power.

In the north-west, too, the imperial cause made strides. At the end of January imperial commissioners were sent to enforce the long-threatened Catholic restoration in Cologne. The Protestant Archbishop, Hermann von Wied, had been suspended by the Pope, and his offer to abdicate in return for a guarantee for the maintenance of Protestantism was rejected; Count Adolf of Schaumburg was elected coadjutor; on February 25 Hermann resigned and Catholicism was forcibly re-established. In the same month Duke Henry of Brunswick captured Minden and regained his duchy. For these successes the inactivity of Landgrave Philip was largely responsible. At the critical moment his former vigour was lost in vacillation. His son-in-law Maurice was seeking to separate him from the Elector, and Philip gave Maurice warning when John Frederick marched against him. But he could not make up his mind to accept the terms that were offered, and the final catastrophe, which he did nothing to avert, left him at Charles' uncovenanted mercy.

The Landgrave and the Elector seemed to have exchanged their accustomed parts, for while Philip was wasting the precious moments John Frederick was exerting himself with unwonted resolution and success. Maurice's treachery had alienated the whole of Saxony; and John Frederick's appearance at the beginning of December, 1546, was the signal for a great outburst of enthusiasm for his cause. He rapidly recovered the whole of his own territories, extended his influence over the sees of Merseburg, Halberstadt, and Magdeburg, and invaded Albertine Saxony. He defeated and captured Margrave Albrecht of Culmbach at Rochlitz, and overran all Maurice's lands with the exception of Leipzig. His cousin complained that most of his subjects favoured John Frederick, and thought of fleeing to Königsberg. The Lutherans of Lusatia and Silesia and the Utraquists of Bohemia refused to follow Ferdinand in support of Maurice. They were much more anxious to preserve their own lands from Spanish troops; they entered into negotiations with John Frederick, threatened to withdraw their allegiance from Ferdinand, whose hold on the Bohemian throne was at that moment weakened by the death of his wife, the daughter of Wladislav II, and received John Frederick with open arms when he crossed the frontier. North Germany seemed at last to be roused to a sense of danger; a league was in course of formation including Magdeburg, Bremen, Brunswick, and Hamburg, and Christopher of Oldenburg and Albrecht of Mansfeld were prepared to support it.

At this moment, when the fortune of war seemed to be turning, the tide began to set against Charles in other quarters. The spiritual and

the temporal head of Christendom could never agree long together even when fighting a common foe, and Charles V and Paul III were now at enmity. The Emperor had demanded the Council of Trent because a Council was essential to his policy; the Pope had summoned the Council because he could not help it. Charles wanted to reform the Papacy, Paul did not. Paul desired an emphatic restatement of dogma; Charles, with his eye on wavering Lutherans, required a discreet silence; and this fundamental difference between the imperial and papal parties soon provoked a breach. So early as July, 1546, there were rumours that the Pope would remove the Council to an Italian city where it would be under his exclusive control, and against this proposal Charles protested in October. His concessions to his Lutheran allies and to the south-western cities offended papal orthodoxy, while his success in the field alarmed a Pope who dreaded nothing so much as a drastic reform of the Church at the hands of a militant Emperor. In January, 1547, the publication of the decrees of the Council on the question of Justification by Faith extinguished Charles' chances of conciliating the Lutherans; and at the same moment Paul did what he could to prevent their subjection by recalling the papal contingent. To such a pass had things come that the Pope was rejoicing at the Elector's successes; and in March the Council of Trent, on the pretext of the plague, removed to Bologna. The Emperor now joined the Lutherans in refusing to recognise the Council's authority; while papal agents stirred up plots against the imperialists in Siena and Venice, Genoa and Naples. Charles overwhelmed the Pope and his legate with abuse, and his threats to find a remedy for this evil again turned men's thoughts back to 1527.

But first he must deal with the successful rebel in northern Germany. John Frederick, however, was not really dangerous, and the successive deaths of Henry VIII (January 28) and Francis I (March 31) guaranteed Charles immunity from external complications. Charles rose to the crisis and wisely determined, in spite of Granvelle's protests, to march north himself. He spent Easter at Eger, and on April 13 crossed the Saxon frontier. The Elector had formed a prudent plan of avoiding pitched battles, retiring to Magdeburg, and leaving Charles to fritter away his strength in sieges; but unfortunately for himself John Frederick could not resist the temptation to keep in touch with Bohemia, whence he expected material help. So he stationed part of his forces on the Bohemian frontier, and with the rest occupied Meissen on the right bank of the Elbe. Charles advanced by rapid marches through Plauen, Altenburg, and Kolditz, cut off the Elector from Thuringia, and threatened his communications with the north, where he trusted, in case of defeat, to find refuge. Alarmed by this movement John Frederick broke up his camp at Meissen and made his way down the Elbe towards Wittenberg. He hoped that Charles would march on Meissen and thus give him time to escape; but the

Emperor went straight for Mühlberg, where he found the Elector at nine a.m. on April 24. A bridge of boats was moored to the right bank of the Elbe, but some Spaniards swam the river with swords in their mouths, cut down the guards, and secured the bridge. By it the bulk of the infantry crossed, while the cavalry found a ford higher up. Without attempting to defend his position the Elector commenced a retreat to the north. About sunset the imperialists overtook him and routed his slender forces with great slaughter. John Frederick fought with conspicuous courage, and was brought into the Emperor's presence with blood streaming from a wound in his cheek. Charles was not generous in the hour of victory; he taunted the Elector with his previous disobedience, while Ferdinand demanded his execution. A sentence of death was actually passed, but it was only used to extort the surrender of Wittenberg, which the Spanish troops were afraid to storm. By the capitulation of Wittenberg Maurice received his cousin's electoral dignity, and a considerable slice of his territories, while Sagan and the Voigtland fell to the share of Ferdinand. John Frederick was carried about a prisoner in the Emperor's suite; but no threats could shake his steadfast adherence to the Lutheran faith, and three years later Charles secretly decreed that his detention should last as long as his life.

From the Elector he turned to the Landgrave, whose submission was delayed by the successful resistance of Bremen to Eric of Brunswick and Christopher von Wrisberg, and by the defeat, much more sanguinary than the battle of Mühlberg, which Christopher of Oldenburg and Albrecht of Mansfeld inflicted upon the imperialists near the Drakensberg. But these victories only saved the Baltic lands; in the west Philip could find no support, and after much hesitation he was induced to surrender by Maurice and Joachim of Brandenburg. The two Princes pledged their word to Philip that he should not be imprisoned, but for this they apparently had no warrant. The popular legend that the term *ohne einigen Gefangnis* (without any imprisonment) was altered by a secretary to *ohne ewigen Gefangnis* (without perpetual imprisonment) has no satisfactory basis; but it is clear that both Philip and the two Princes understood that the Landgrave should go free, and there were high words between them and Alva, when, after Philip had made his submission (June 20), the Duke placed him under arrest. Such had been Charles' intention throughout; he does not appear to have encouraged any deception, and subsequently the two Princes admitted that the mistake had been theirs. It was an unfortunate mistake for Charles' reputation; but for the rest Philip escaped more lightly than John Frederick, a circumstance which he owed to Maurice, and not to his deserts. In 1550 his term of detention was fixed at fifteen years; he was to dismantle all his fortresses save one, and to give up his artillery; his territories were to remain intact and his people unmolested on account of their religion;

though subsequently half of Darmstadt was transferred from Hesse to the House of Nassau.

In the north-east of Germany the Dukes of Pomerania made peace with Charles through their agent Bartholomew Sastrow, whose memoirs present a gloomy picture of the condition of Germany during the war. Bremen held out, but more important was the resistance of Magdeburg, which ultimately defied all the force which Maurice was able or willing to bring against it. A proposal to bring Albrecht of Prussia to terms was rejected lest warlike measures should precipitate a conflict with his suzerain Sigismund of Poland; but in Bohemia Ferdinand used his opportunity to crush its remaining constitutional liberties, and to reduce it to a footing more nearly resembling that of his own hereditary lands.

Except for Constance and these outlying regions on the Baltic, Charles was now dictator in Germany. No Emperor since Frederick II had wielded such power, and at the Diet of Augsburg which was opened on September 1, 1547, he endeavoured to reap the fruits of his victory. He never had a greater opportunity, but the inherent antagonism between the aims of the Habsburg dynasty and those of the German nation was too fundamental to be eradicated by the defeat of a section of Lutheran Princes. The constitutional reforms which he laid before the Diet were inspired by the same family motives which actuated Charles in 1521, and they provoked the same kind of national and territorial opposition. Bavaria reverted to its natural attitude, partly because Charles had quarrelled with the Pope, but more because he had not repaid Bavaria for her exertions in the war by an increase of territory, nor shown any inclination to transfer the Electoral dignity of the Palatinate from his old friend, the Elector Frederick II, to Duke William. Maurice was not satisfied with the partial ruin of his cousin, and felt that Charles had purposely left his position insecure.

The Emperor's first object was to strengthen the executive with a view to preventing such outbreaks as the Peasants' War, the Anabaptist revolt, the lawless enterprises of Lübeck, and Philip of Hesse's conquests of Wurttemberg and Brunswick. A proposal for the preservation of peace would naturally meet with much support; but that support was neutralised by the conviction that the League, which Charles proposed to establish on the model of the old Swabian League, was really designed to strengthen the Habsburgs against other Princes and against the nation itself. The League was to embrace the whole of Germany, to be directed by a number of permanent officials who although representative of the various orders would tend to fall under government influence, and to have at its disposal an efficient military force. This League and its organisation was to lie entirely outside the ordinary constitution of the Empire; and the Electors discovered the chief motive for it in the fact that the Habsburgs would command a far greater share of influence in it than they did in the three Councils which constituted the Diet.

However, the real flaw in the Emperor's plan was that he did not seek to reform the Diet, but left it standing, while a new organisation was introduced which was bound to come into conflict with existing institutions and could only supersede them after a long and wearisome constitutional struggle. Both its good points and its defects excited discontent. The territorial Princes feared to lose their hold over mediate lords when the latter would look not to them but to the League for protection; the cities dreaded the expense of having to keep internal and external peace in outlying lands like Burgundy and the Austrian Duchies. Bavaria had resolved to refuse, even if all the other Estates agreed; the College of Electors was unanimously hostile; the Diet as a whole disliked a measure which would bring its own authority into dispute, and Charles dropped the proposal without a struggle.

He was more fortunate in his reconstitution of the *Reichskammergericht*; he arrogated to himself the immediate nomination of its judges, reserved to his own *Hofgericht* questions of Church property and episcopal jurisdiction, and persuaded the Diet to adopt a codification of the principles by which the action of the Court should be governed, and to promise contributions for the Court's support. He was able to defy the remonstrances addressed to him on account of the Spanish troops, which, contrary to his election pledges, he had quartered in the Empire. He secured the establishment of a fund for the maintenance of internal and external peace, which was not, however, to be used without the Diet's consent; and obtained preferential treatment for the Netherlands by means of a perpetual treaty between them and the Empire. They were to contribute to national taxation but to be exempt from the national jurisdiction; they were thus partly removed from imperial control, though Germany was perpetually bound to the arduous task of their defence; the transfer of Utrecht and Gelders to the Burgundian circle was a mark of their incorporation in the Habsburg inheritance.

Meanwhile religion naturally occupied much of the attention of Charles and the Diet. The Emperor vowed that even when in the field against his enemies he had thought more about the Church than the war; and it was incumbent upon him to attempt some sort of solution at the Diet of Augsburg. The problem, difficult in any case, was rendered infinitely more so by his strained relations with the Pope; which the murder of Paul's son, Pierluigi Farnese, on September 10, 1547, with the suspected connivance of Ferrante di Gonzaga, the governor of Milan, of Granvelle, and even of Charles himself, did nothing to improve. The Pope was hardened in his determination not to let the Council leave Bologna. The Emperor obtained a unanimous recognition from the Estates to the effect that the prelates remaining at Trent constituted the only true Council. They also approved of Charles' refusal to publish the Tridentine decrees; and, going further than he desired, they demanded that Scripture should be the test applied to all doctrines,

and that the members of the Council should be released from their oaths to the Pope, in order that they might more effectually reform the Papacy. In the name of the German nation Charles formally required the return of the Council to Trent; and when this was refused, his two representatives, Vargas and Velasco, solemnly protested on January 18, 1548, against all future acts of the Council at Bologna, declaring them null and void.

Was Charles also among the prophets? He, even as Philip of Hesse and John Frederick of Saxony, had protested against a General Council and refused to be bound by its decrees. Had he been as devoid of religious scruples as Maurice of Saxony or Henry of Navarre, and had he had only German feelings to consult, he would in 1548 have become an ostensible Protestant. But Charles would never have bought a kingdom with a Mass; he preferred to lose a kingdom for a Mass, and, in spite of his enmity with the Papacy, he was bent on making Germany Catholic, and on using his victory to decide questions upon which he had declared the struggle would not be fought. At the same time his refusal to accept the Tridentine decrees as the standard of faith made it necessary for him to evolve some criterion of his own which should serve its purpose during the interval until a General Council should formulate conclusions acceptable both to him and the Pope. With this object in view, after a fruitless discussion by a committee consisting of representative laymen as well as ecclesiastics, he took into consultation Michael Helding, the suffragan Bishop of Mainz, who represented the high Catholic point of view, the Erasmian Julius von Pflug, whom the result of the Schmalkaldic War had at last established as Bishop of Naumburg, and John Agricola, whose views were Lutheran, of a moderate type. The compromise, known as the *Interim*, which this commission drew up, conceded clerical marriages, the use of the cup by the laity, and accepted a modification of the doctrine of justification by faith. Pflug also explained away enough of the sacrificial character of the Mass to satisfy some of the Lutherans, and denied some of the prerogatives claimed by the Pope. On the other hand the *Interim* retained all the seven Sacraments, the worship of the Virgin and the Saints, fasts, processions, and other Catholic ceremonies, and reaffirmed the dogma of transubstantiation.

The reception of the *Interim* by the College of Electors was on the whole favourable. Joachim of Brandenburg rejoiced to see included in it the three concessions which formed the basis of his compact with Charles in 1541; the Elector Palatine concurred. Maurice wanted to consult his Estates, but Charles represented to him that no provincial assembly could override the decisions of a Diet. The Emperor had more to fear from the College of Princes, where the Bishops and Bavaria were preponderant on the Catholic side. The Count Palatine Wolfgang of Neumark and Margrave Hans of Cüstrin, as zealous Lutherans, offered a strenuous opposition. Duke William of Bavaria had Catholic

and other scruples, and referred them to the Pope. Paul III had also conscientious scruples and remembered Pierluigi. He replied that the Emperor had nothing to do with matters of doctrine, which must be reserved for the Council at Bologna; points on which the Council had already decided should be adopted without alteration by the Diet; and on questions, which the Council had not yet settled, the *Interim* contained several assertions repugnant to the Catholic faith. Armed with this opinion the College of Princes resolved that all Church property must be restored, that the concession of the Cup to the laity and of clerical marriages could only be made effective by papal dispensation, and above all that the *Interim* must not apply to Catholic territories. In other words, the compromise was to bind one party but not the other, and Lutherans were to accept such concessions as they had obtained subject to the Pope's grace and favour. Charles was incensed at this attempt to spoil the concordat, and told the Princes that they must accept the articles as they stood. This they refused to do. The Emperor was compelled to give an assurance that the *Interim* had no other object than the conversion of backsliders from the faith; and several alterations were made in its wording without the knowledge of the Protestants. In this form the *Interim* was proclaimed as an edict on May 15, 1548; but the vague terms in which the Elector of Mainz expressed the Diet's concurrence did not imply that unanimous concurrence which Charles read into its declaration.

It needed more than sleight of hand to compel the edict's observance, but Charles was resolved to stick at no measures, however violent. He disregarded the oral assurances given to the cities before their surrender, and his councillor Hase averred that Spanish troops should teach them Catholic truth. At Augsburg and Ulm the city franchises were violated, the democratic Councils purged of refractory members, and their places supplied by rich Catholic merchants like the Fuggers and Welsers. Constance yielded after a brilliant defence of its bridge which recalled the exploit of Horatius Cocles, and surrendered its privileges as an imperial city to be merged in the Habsburg domains. Divines who refused to submit became exiles. Osiander left Nurnberg, Brenz left Swabian Hall, and Blarer Constance; Schnepf was driven from Tübingen, and Bucer and Fagius from Strassburg. The last two found a home in Cambridge, and many others came to spread the doctrines of reform in England; over four hundred divines are said to have left southern Germany.

In northern Germany the rulers who had submitted to Charles generally accepted the *Interim*, but Maurice was compelled to pay tribute to Lutheran sentiment, and employed for this purpose Bishop Pflug of Naumburg, the most conciliatory of Catholic divines. He was met in the same spirit by Melanchthon, who, much to the Emperor's annoyance, still enjoyed safety and power in Wittenberg.

Melanchthon's attitude was similar to that of 1530, and aroused much discontent among the bolder Lutherans; his criticisms of Luther and John Frederick seemed oblivious of his former relations with them and of the facts that one was dead and the other in prison. At a conference with the Catholics at Pegau he gave away much of the Lutheran case; but the *Interim* met with greater resistance at a second debate at Torgau in October, 1548, and was likened to the forbidden fruit with which Eve tempted Adam. At Celle, however, in the following month its advocates once more prevailed, and the formulary which they drew up was adopted at a Saxon Diet at Leipzig; thence it took the name of the *Leipzig Interim* and became the rule for Saxon lands.

Over almost the whole of Germany the *Interim* was now enforced, and Charles was so elated by his success that he thought of pressing its acceptance upon the Scandinavian kingdoms, upon England, and even upon Russia. Yet his triumph was illusory and short-lived; even Melanchthon, who conformed, secretly counselled resistance, and people followed his private precept rather than his public example. Three years later two English ambassadors at Charles' court gave a description of the situation in Augsburg. An imperial commission had charged the ministers of that city with preaching against the *Interim* and refusing to say Mass in their churches. The divines replied that they durst say none, being more loth to offend God than willing to please man; the Apostles had neither said nor heard Mass; and for themselves if they were in fault the fault was no new one, for they had said no masses for fourteen years. They were then compelled to leave the city, which remained disconsolate; there were few shops in which people might not be seen in tears; a hundred women besieged the Emperor's gates "howling and asking in their outcries where they should christen their children," and where they should marry. "For all this the Papist churches have no more customers than they had; not ten of the townsmen in some of their greatest synagogues. The churches where the Protestants did by thousands at once communicate are locked up, and the people, being robbed of all their godly exercises, sit weeping and wailing at home." Strassburg and Nürnberg were in no better mood; when Charles required the young Duke Christopher of Württemberg to expel John Brenz, he replied that he was as willing as the Emperor to do so, but it was not in his power unless he could expel all his subjects with him.

Against a spirit like this the Emperor laboured in vain. It availed him little that Paul III in his dying days recognised the *Interim* and dissolved the Council at Bologna; that Julius III repaired his predecessor's error and sent his prelates to Trent where Charles' Bishops still kept up the continuity of the Council; or that in January, 1552, some Protestant delegates appeared there and reinforced the opposition to the Pope. The reunion did not assuage the struggle between papal and

imperial influence. In the demand that the points already decided must be reconsidered, Vargas, Charles V's representative, concurred with the Protestants, and wrote to the Emperor a series of letters exposing the papal intrigues at the previous sessions of the Council, which has been used with effect by Protestant historians. He even welcomed the proposal of Maurice's commissioners that doctrines should be tested by the Scriptures, and pressed hotly for a practical reformation of the Papacy. It was Charles' view that if the Lutherans would come within the pale of the Church as he defined it, they would be useful allies against the Pope. But his definition was the *Interim*, and the effort to force that definition on his subjects electrified the atmosphere and prepared it for the storm which Charles' dynastic and absolutist projects brought down upon his head.

Nothing illustrates more vividly Charles' incurable want of sympathy with his German subjects or the incompatibility of his family ambitions with the national tendencies of the age than his attempt to force his son Philip into the seat of the German Emperors. National antipathy to France had contributed more than anything else to his own election, yet he thought he could defy a far deeper hostility to the Spaniards. The foreign character of his own aims had been responsible for much of the opposition he experienced in Germany, though he had at least been brought up in nominally imperial territory. Yet he imagined that Philip could succeed who had lived all his life in Spain and was purely Spanish in feeling. No Spaniard had hitherto ruled in Germany—for Alfonso of Castile can scarcely be cited as an exception—and the Reformation, added to other causes, made it impossible that a Spaniard should ever rule there in the future. Spain and Germany represented opposite poles of religious and political ideals, and the attempt to unite them under one rule would inevitably have proved as disastrous in Germany as a similar attempt did in the Netherlands. Charles in fact was a hybrid physically, politically, and to some extent ecclesiastically; and the parts of his cosmopolitan Empire necessarily reverted to their original national types.

In his endeavour to perform the impossible Charles nearly produced a rupture in the Habsburg family, and alienated all the German Princes. His plan was that Philip should be elected King of the Romans when Ferdinand became Emperor, and that thus after Ferdinand's death the Empire should remain with the elder line of the family. Ferdinand was led to believe, however, that the design extended to Philip's immediate succession and his own exclusion from the throne, and this was the current suspicion in Germany. He long and strenuously opposed his brother's plan; and the quarrel between them was only patched up by the intervention of their sister Maria from the Netherlands. Eventually it was agreed (1551) that Philip should succeed Ferdinand, but that Ferdinand's son Maximilian should succeed Philip. This healed the

family breach but had no effect on the other German Princes; and the Electors, with wise regard for their own interests and national liberties, unanimously refused even to consider the scheme.

The whole nation in fact was growing day by day more hostile to Charles and his Spanish troops. The garrisons scattered throughout the Empire, few though they were in numbers, created the impression that Germany was a conquered country; and Spanish arrogance lost no opportunity of bringing this sense home to the German mind. Granvelle was suspected of harbouring a design for the partition of Germany. Hatred, which was at first limited to the Spaniards themselves, began to embrace the Emperor as he repeatedly refused to listen to the Diet's complaints of their conduct and of his infraction of his engagements He also wounded military feelings by forbidding the service of German mercenaries in foreign armies—a practice which he had often licensed himself—and by summarily hanging Sebastian Vogelsberger for defying his commands. Discontent was expressed with Charles' proposal to invest his son with the Netherlands on terms which rendered those provinces an hereditary appanage of the Habsburg family, independent of the Empire and transmissible to female heirs; and even Catholics were offended at the persecution to which Philip of Hesse and John Frederick were subjected. The former believed that the Emperor intended to carry him off to Spain, and when he attempted to escape his German guards were exchanged for Spaniards. The three lay Electors, most of the Princes, and even Ferdinand, petitioned for Philip's release; but Charles turned a deaf ear and decided that his detention should last for fifteen years, though he was afraid to publish the sentence.

While Charles' popularity in Germany was being thus undermined, his prestige abroad was rapidly waning. His power in Germany from 1547 to 1550 had really rested upon a fortunate coincidence of external circumstances, the absorption of England and France in their mutual struggles and the diversion of the Turks to the East. But such a combination of propitious conditions could not last. By 1550 France had recovered Boulogne, established her influence in Scotland, and compelled England to make peace; and it was generally anticipated that this peace would be followed by war with the Emperor. The naval warfare in the Mediterranean between Dragut and Charles' admirals began to go against the imperialists; and the loss of Tripoli (August, 1551) more than counterbalanced the previous gain of Mehedia. The Turk again turned his attention towards Hungary, where the remnants of Zapolya's kingdom acknowledged the nominal sway of his son but the real rule of George Martinuzzi. His domination proving intolerable to Zapolya's widow, she appealed to the Sultan, while Martinuzzi sought to make terms with Ferdinand. Ferdinand's request for assistance from the Diet was coldly received by Charles, and his envoy in Transylvania, Castaldo, suspecting that Martinuzzi intended treachery, had him

murdered with Ferdinand's connivance (December, 1551). The Turks thereupon began to advance, while the disputes of the Farnese in Italy, where France supported Orazio and the Emperor Ottavio, brought Henry II and Charles to the verge of war.

Under these circumstances men began to desert the Emperor's failing cause. Maurice, who had betrayed his cousin, would not adhere too scrupulously to Charles; he was highly unpopular in Saxony on account of his religious backsliding and his political treachery, and unless he found independent means of support he would go down with the Emperor's ruin; his own subjects were already thinking of placing his brother Augustus in his place, and his nobles declined to assist him in the siege of Magdeburg. So gradually he began to dissociate himself from the Emperor's fortunes; he supported Maximilian in his opposition to Philip's succession, and the Landgrave's sons in their attempt to secure some mitigation of their father's lot. He obtained in the autumn of 1550 a useful basis of operations, being entrusted by the Diet, in spite of the reluctance of Charles, who already suspected his intentions, with the conduct of the siege of Magdeburg. That city had been placed under the ban of the Empire for its continued resistance to Charles and to his religious measures; on September 22, 1550, its troops had been defeated by Duke George of Mecklenburg, but the citizens spurned all proposals for submission. Their indomitable resistance had stirred a fever of enthusiasm in Lutheran Germany; and the acceptance of the task of subduing them evoked renewed taunts of "Judas" against the Saxon usurper.

But it was not Protestantism which Maurice intended to betray this time. His character remains to this day an enigma; elaborate attempts have been made to represent him not merely as the ablest statesman of his age but as the champion of German Protestantism, consistently working in its interest. According to this theory his original desertion of the Schmalkaldic League was only a necessary step towards his ultimate victory over Charles and the forces of reaction. To others his career appears to be a masterpiece of treachery, and Maurice himself a subtle intriguer comparable only with his contemporary the Duke of Northumberland, who like him played an unscrupulous and selfish part under the mask of religion. In Maurice the territorial ambition of German Princes found its most skilful exponent: his religious creed was but an accident of circumstances. No pronounced Catholic could have maintained himself in ducal Saxony or held the Ernestine electorate; but Charles' help was indispensable for the overthrow of John Frederick, and Charles' help could not be purchased without some concessions to orthodoxy. This object having been achieved Maurice proceeded to rid himself of a dangerously unpopular ally; and he was as successful in choosing the right moment for leaving Charles as he had been when he deserted the Schmalkaldic League.

The popular antipathy to Charles and his Spaniards, the genuine votion of the middle classes to Lutheranism, were the levers which aurice and his fellow-Princes used for their own ends. They rebelled ither to free the German nation, nor to redeem the true religion. neir real motive was fear lest Charles should establish a strong monarchy, id reduce their oligarchy to the impotence to which they had endeavoured reduce his sovereignty. This apprehension had begun to work soon ter the battle of Muhlberg. As early as 1548 Otto of Brunswick-arburg was intriguing in France with Henry II, who suggested a orth-German-Polish league, the germ of the later alliance between rance and Poland against the House of Habsburg. Negotiations were on in train between the young Landgrave William of Hesse, Margrave ans of Cüstrin, Duke Albrecht of Prussia, and his suzerain Sigismund ugustus, the King of Poland. The soul of the movement was Hans Custrin, whose refusal to acknowledge the *Interim* had provoked e wrath of Charles V, and whose dominions in Cottbus and Crössen, e one surrounded and the other bounded by Ferdinand's lands, excited at King's desires. In February, 1550, a defensive league was formed etween Hans of Cüstrin, Johann Albrecht of Mecklenburg, and Duke lbrecht of Prussia at Königsberg; and secret agents were busy in reign lands, Schärtlin in Switzerland and George von Heideck, a cadet f the House of Wurttemberg, in England and the Hanse towns.

Maurice had early information of these movements, but his advances ere viewed with suspicion. Hans of Custrin wished to exclude him d the young Margrave Albrecht Alcibiades of Brandenburg-Culmbach om the league on account of their religious indifference; but the threats the Emperor against Hans and Johann Albrecht of Mecklenburg, d Maurice's success in enticing to his banners the military forces of orthern Germany induced them to listen to his overtures. For this urpose his command gave Maurice every opportunity; in September, 550, he won over the troops of Duke George of Mecklenburg; in anuary, 1551, he secured the Protestant levies of George von Heideck; d in the following month Hans came to terms at Dresden. The eposed and imprisoned Elector was the chief difficulty in Maurice's path. ohn Frederick vowed he would rather end his days in captivity than we freedom to his godless and traitorous cousin; but Maurice carried is point with his allies; and in May Hans of Custrin, Johann Albrecht f Mecklenburg, and Landgrave William of Hesse consented to threaten e young Ernestines with open hostility unless they would join the ague or at least undertake to remain neutral. Maurice also secured uke Albrecht of Prussia, and an envoy was sent to France to request monthly contribution of a hundred thousand crowns. In August, 551, the Bishop of Bayonne came to Hesse, and in the autumn the rms of an alliance between Henry II and the German Princes were utlined. On November 3 Magdeburg capitulated. To Charles Maurice

represented the surrender as a complete imperial victory; but in r the terms of the capitulation guaranteed to the townsfolk the re they desired, and secured to Maurice control of the city and a b operations.

The appeal to France involved a radical alteration of He Cüstrin's original plan. His object had been merely defence a the threatening aspect assumed by Charles V, but mere defenc of no use to Henry II. French support could only be bougl making the league offensive, and offence was also Maurice's Chagrined at having to yield the first place in the league to Ma and alarmed, perhaps, by the terms which Henry II demanded, broke away from the league. A German who was both a patriot Protestant could indeed have been offered no more painful choice. French stipulations were that the Princes should undertake to v Henry wished at the next imperial election, and connive at his cor and administration as imperial vicar of the bishoprics of Metz, Verdun, and Cambray. The imperial lands were to be sacrificed a price of religious security, or rather of princely privilege. Particu was at least as strong a motive with the Princes as Prot or patriotic feeling. They had not crushed the knight, the pe and the Anabaptist in order to smooth Charles' path to a tism, but their own. The Emperor was the last obstacle to th development of territorial despotism, and the real inwardness o struggle is illustrated by the fact that the cities, Protestant though were, for the most part stood aloof or sided with the Emperor. Lutheran North remained passive, and the so-called war of libe presents many of the features of an oligarchic plot.

The treaty between the German Princes and the King of F was signed at Chambord and at Friedwald in January, 1552. I intervened in Germany, as he did in Italy, as the champion of na liberties against the Emperor; and while in March he threw thirt thousand men into Lorraine he hardened his heart against the heret France. In fact his devotion to German freedom although more sp was no more real than his love of toleration; and the German lands fell into his power fared at least as ill as ever they would have under Charles V. The double face which France showed from to 1648, Catholic at home and Protestant abroad, was a religious adopted to help her in her secular rivalry with the House of Au and never did it stand her in better stead than in 1552. In that Henry II avenged the defeats and imprisonment inflicted on his f by Charles V and thus embittered the close of the Emperor's life failure and humiliation.

As the French troops crossed the frontier, Maurice, William of I and Margrave Albrecht Alcibiades concentrated thirty thousand m Franconia. The Emperor was not so ignorant of Maurice's desig

has often been supposed. His commissioner, Lazarus Schwendi, had sounded warning notes from the camp at Magdeburg; but success had made Charles confident and careless, and he failed to realise the danger until it was too late to organise resistance. On April 6 he was thinking of flight to the Netherlands, but the way was blocked already. He suspected Ferdinand's loyalty, and others have believed that the King of the Romans had a secret understanding with Maurice. Ferdinand had ample grounds for discontent, but there seems to be no proof of treason on his part. Maurice, who had outwitted the keenest diplomats at Charles' Court, may well have duped his brother; he had promised to meet the King at Linz on April 4, but Ferdinand was not prepared for the guise in which he came. On that day Augsburg fell before the Princes; the resistance of Nürnberg, Ulm, and Strassburg alone marred the completeness of their victory, for Bavaria and Wurttemberg were their secret allies. On the 18th Maurice was at Linz. Ferdinand sought to negotiate an armistice, but Maurice refused to date it earlier than May 26, and used the interval to draw his net round Charles. In spite of the words attributed to him, that he had no cage big enough for such a bird, Maurice did not shrink from pressing his illustrious fugitive, and hoped, as he said, to run the fox to earth. On the nights of May 18–19 he seized the pass of Ehrenberg. Twelve days earlier Charles had been foiled in an attempt to escape to Constance and to pass on thence to the Netherlands. He had no troops to withstand Maurice; but a mutiny in the Elector's forces gave him a few hours' respite, and towards evening, with a few attendants, he fled amid rain and snow across the Brenner. The victor of Muhlberg was an almost solitary fugitive in his Empire; the assembled Fathers at Trent broke up in dismay, having, it was said, no mind to argue points of doctrine with soldiers in arms; and the Emperor's soaring plans dissolved like castles in Spain.

It was the darkest hour in Charles' career, but soon the twilight began to glimmer. The Emperor found a refuge at Villach in Carinthia, while Maurice went to the conference at Passau, where his own troubles began to gather. He demanded as the price of peace security against Habsburg aggression in Germany, restoration of princely privilege, and a guarantee of the Lutheran religion irrespective of the decrees of the Council of Trent. The Catholic Princes assembled at Passau were disposed to concede these terms, but to connive at permanent schism was incompatible with Charles' rigid Catholic conscience. Nothing could bend his iron will, not the advance of the Turk nor the success of the French in Italy nor his own personal peril. He insisted that the question of religious peace must be referred to a Diet. On that point he refused to yield an inch; and among the circumstances which preserved so large a portion of Germany to the Roman Catholic faith not the least is the unshaken constancy which Charles V evinced at the sorest crisis of the Catholic cause in Germany.

His courage had its reward. Margrave Albrecht had separat from his allies and was pursuing a wild career of murder and sacrile in Franconia, where he dreamt of carving a secular duchy out of t Bishops' spiritualities; in six weeks he extorted nearly a million crowns way of ransom. Maurice failed in his attack on Frankfort, where he lo one of his ablest lieutenants by the death of George of Mecklenbu The advance of Henry II had been checked by the valour of Strassbur Charles had released John Frederick, and with a little help the Ernesti Wettin could raise a storm which would drive his cousin from Saxon while Hans of Cüstrin would willingly join in the fray in return for share of the Albertine lands. Conscious that the nation was not real behind him and that he would lose his all by defeat, Maurice reluctant yielded to Charles' demand that the religious question should be l to a Diet. Margrave Albrecht roughly refused to accept the peac and when Maurice marched to help Ferdinand against the Turl many of his troops mutinied and took service with Albrecht. T Margrave's disgust was not due to zeal for the Protestant faith, but the fact that Maurice had played both hands in the game and reduc his partner to a dummy. Fortune seemed to be turning and Char thought of refusing to ratify the treaty, delayed the liberation of Phi of Hesse, and returned to his schemes for creating a friendly league a securing the Empire for his son. He appeared to have learnt a forgotten nothing, but his advisers were more amenable. Queen Ma opposed these plans, Ferdinand denounced them, and the fear lest obstinacy should drive his brother into Maurice's arms induced Char to submit and sign the Treaty of Passau.

Reluctantly the Emperor surrendered for the moment his dynas projects and assumed the part of the champion of Germany against French invader. Emerging from Villach and journeying by way Augsburg, where he could not refrain from once more overthrowing democratic government and expelling some of the more obnoxi preachers who had returned in Maurice's train, Charles appeared on Rhine determined to wrest Metz, Toul, and Verdun from the Fren Metz was the key of the situation, and it had been amply provision and skilfully fortified by the Duke of Guise. On the last day October, 1552, the siege was formally opened, and Charles strengther his forces by an unscrupulous alliance with Albrecht Alcibiades. T Margrave's brutalities had roused all Franconia against him and he h been forced to flee to the Court of Henry II; but Court life had attractions for him, and the French King hesitated to entrust so doubt an ally with important commands. So Albrecht escaped, captured t Duke of Aumale, and with this peace-offering came into Charles' can His terms were the imperial sanction of his spoliation of the Bishops Würzburg and Bamberg. "Necessity knows no law," wrote Charles his sister, as he struck his bargain with the worst law-breaker

Germany and sanctioned his sacrilegious plunder of Bamberg and Würzburg. But Albrecht could not remedy the defects of Alva's generalship, produce harmony between Germans and Spaniards in the Emperor's army, or make any impression on Metz. For a month after his generals had recognised that success was impossible Charles refused to admit his defeat. But at length the havoc wrought among his Italian and Spanish troops by a mid-winter siege conquered even his obstinacy. With a grumble at the fickleness of Fortune who preferred a young King to an old Emperor, he raised the siege on January 1, 1553, and turned his back on his German dominions for ever. Success in the war with France would have meant a renewed effort to divide and crush the Lutheran Princes, to rivet the Spanish succession on Germany, and to restore the Catholic faith. Charles' failure left Germany free to settle these questions herself. Already meditating abdication and retirement from the world, the Emperor journeyed to Brussels; he was cheered by the capture of Térouanne from the French and the triumph of Mary in England, but German affairs were resigned into the hands of the King of the Romans.

The evil which Charles had done by his bargain with Albrecht survived his departure, and it is a lurid comment upon the Emperor's reign that its last days were characterised by as wild an anarchy as Germany had known in all her turbulent history. The Margrave, having performed a last service to Charles by saving his guns during the retreat from Metz, proceeded once more to trouble his foes in Germany; and, as nearly all Germany hated the Emperor, Albrecht was free to turn his arms in whatever direction he chose. The League of Heidelberg, formed in March, 1553, for the preservation of the peace and prevention of Philip's election, consisted of Catholics and Protestants and was too general to be very effective. Moreover Albrecht's onslaughts on Bishops and priests won him a good deal of secret sympathy. The situation was full of confusion; the Emperor, the extreme Protestants, and the Ernestine Wettins and Margrave Albrecht, were all in more or less open opposition to the Albertine Maurice, King Ferdinand, and the Heidelberg League. Charles had more than once divided the Lutherans; he had now divided the House of Habsburg.

Maurice alone could restore peace to the Empire. His campaign in Hungary had not been successful, and Zapolya's widow with Solyman's help retained control of Transylvania. But Persia once more diverted the Turk's attention from west to east, and gave Maurice and Ferdinand respite to deal with Albrecht and his notorious lieutenant, Wilhelm von Grumbach. Maurice, who had posed as the liberator of Germany from Spanish tyranny, was now to play the part of saviour of society from princely anarchy. Charles had left the Empire to its fate, the Heidelberg League was powerless, and a decree of the *Reichskammergericht* against Albrecht would be a mere form of words. Could

Maurice succeed amid this maze of impotence, no prize might be beyond his reach. At Eger he concerted measures with Ferdinand and despatched his brother for Danish aid. Albrecht, after winning another victory at Pommersfelden on April 11, renewed his ravages in Franconia, and his excesses were worse than those of the Peasants' War. He then turned against the Catholic Duke Henry of Brunswick-Wolfenbüttel, and thought of utilising John Frederick's hatred of Maurice and Elector Joachim's friendship with Charles to draw them both to his side; even Landgrave Philip of Hesse was loth to assist his son-in-law against so good an enemy of the priests. On July 9, 1553, at Sievershausen, the forces of Albrecht and Maurice met. It was the fiercest battle fought in German lands for many a day; beside it Mühlberg was the merest skirmish. Maurice won the day, but lost his life; a wound from a musket-ball proved fatal on the 11th, and one of the most extraordinary careers in history was cut short at the age of thirty-two years.

The death of Maurice brought no redress to his injured and aged cousin. The Saxon Electorate continued in the Albertine branch of the family, passing to Maurice's brother Augustus, a man of conciliatory temper, who had incurred none of the odium attaching to Maurice and could look for support to his Danish father-in-law Christian III. Charles V had no longer a private grudge to revenge by restoring his former captive. John Frederick did not survive the disappointment by many months. He died on March 3, 1554, a classic instance of fortune's perversity. He suffered more severely than any Prince of his age, and his coveted electoral dignity passed into a rival House, never to be restored; and the only solace vouchsafed to the Ernestine branch was the restitùtion of Altenburg, Neustadt, and some other districts ceded to Maurice in 1547. Yet John Frederick was the most blameless of men, "the example of constancy and very mirror of true magnanimity in these our days to all Princes." Such is the verdict of one contemporary; better known is the glowing description by Roger Ascham: "one in all fortunes desired of his friends, reverenced of his foes, favoured of the Emperor, loved of all."

With the disappearance of Maurice the Emperor's interest in Albrecht Alcibiades waned. It was in vain that the Margrave beat the anti-ecclesiastical drum more furiously than ever, or that many a north German Prince and city came to secret terms. Duke Henry of Brunswick displayed unwonted vigour and defeated Albrecht at Steterburg on September 12, 1553. On December 1 the long-delayed ban was proclaimed, and a second victory won by Duke Henry at Schwarzach on June 13, 1554, drove Albrecht again as a fugitive to the French Court. Peace was at length restored, and Germany prepared for that Diet which was to settle its religious affairs for two generations. Permanent toleration of heresy was inevitable in the existing condition of German politics, and the prospect of such unwelcome violence to his conscience determined

the Emperor definitely to withdraw from his imperial responsibilities. His formal abdication of the Empire was not made till three years later; his relinquishment of the Netherlands only took place in 1555, and that of his Spanish kingdoms in 1556; but the end of his reign in Germany may be dated from the summer of 1554, when he empowered Ferdinand to settle the question of religion with the Diet, but not in his name.

The city which had witnessed the birth of the Lutheran Faith was also to see its legitimation, and on February 5, 1555, Ferdinand opened another great Diet at Augsburg. No Elector was present in person; of the ecclesiastical Princes only two, the Bishops of Augsburg and Eichstadt, attended, and of temporal Princes only four, the young Archduke Charles, the Dukes of Bavaria and Württemberg, and the Margrave of Baden. The Catholics still had a majority in the Diet, and it cost them a severe mental struggle to relinquish the fundamental position of Catholicism, the seamless unity of the Christian Church. But common action with Protestants in opposition to the Spanish Succession, in defence of princely privilege against Charles and of public peace against Albrecht, had paved the way, not to an agreement in religious matters, but to an agreement to differ about them. Yet even this compromise was not reached till Ferdinand had made one more effort to save ecclesiastical unity. He proposed that the Diet should first deal with the question of public peace and refer religion to a Council or to a conference. Duke Christopher of Wurttemberg and the Elector of Brandenburg were not averse to the idea, and the latter even suggested the *Interim* as the basis of an agreement. But the hand of the Diet was forced by the Lutheran Convention at Naumburg, which was attended by more German Princes than the Diet itself. Here it was determined to abide by the Confession of Augsburg, and this decision was upheld by the Elector Augustus, the sons of John Frederick, and the Landgraves of Hesse, while the Elector Joachim hastily withdrew his ill-advised suggestion with regard to the *Interim*.

Thereupon the Electoral College at Augsburg decided to deal with the religious question at once and demanded religious peace at any price. The Catholic Princes, led by the Cardinal Archbishop of *Augsburg*, protested; but Christopher of Württemberg came over to the Protestant side, and presently the Bishop of Augsburg was summoned to Conclaves at Rome, necessitated by the successive deaths of Julius III and Marcellus II. The Protestants now put forward their full demands. They required security not merely for all present but all future subscribers to the Confession of Augsburg, and liberty to enjoy not only such ecclesiastical property as had already been secularised but all that might be confiscated hereafter; Lutherans in Catholic States were to have complete toleration, while no such privilege was to be accorded to Catholics in Lutheran territories. They sought in fact to reduce the Catholics to

the position to which they had themselves been reduced by the Recess o Speier in 1529; every legal obstacle to the Lutheran development wa to be removed, while Catholics were deprived of their means of defence.

The Catholics were not yet brought so low as to submit to suc terms; for months the struggle of parties went on, and it seemed possibl that another religious war might ensue. Eventually a compromise wa arranged mainly by Ferdinand and Augustus of Saxony. Security wa granted to all Lutheran Princes; episcopal jurisdiction in their lands wa to cease; and they might retain all ecclesiastical property secularise before the Treaty of Passau (1552), provided it was not immediatel subject to the Empire. For the future each territorial secular Princ might choose between the Catholic and Lutheran faith, and his decisio was to bind all his subjects. If a subject rejected his sovereign's religio the only privilege he could claim was liberty to migrate into other lands There remained two all-important points in dispute. The Lutheran still required toleration for the adherents of their confession in Catholi States; and the Catholics demanded that any ecclesiastical Prince, wh abjured Catholicism, should forfeit his lands and dignities. The Catholi objections to the first demand were insuperable; and the Lutherans wer compelled to content themselves with an assurance by Ferdinand, whic was not incorporated in the Recess, did not become law of the Empir and of which the *Reichskammergericht* could therefore take no cognisanc The Catholic requirement about spiritual Princes was met by the famou "ecclesiastical reservation" which imposed forfeiture of lands and dignitie on Bishops who forsook the Catholic faith. This was incorporated in th Recess; but the Lutherans made their own reservation, and declare that they did not consider themselves bound by the proviso.

The so-called Peace of Augsburg, embodied in the Recess which wa published on September 25, 1555, thus rested upon a double equivocatio and contained in itself the seeds of the Thirty Years' War. It was i fact no more than a truce concluded, not because the two parties ha decided the issues upon which they fought, but because they were fo the moment tired of fighting, and no half-measure was ever pursue by a more relentless Nemesis. The "ecclesiastical reservation" has bee condemned as the worst sin of omission of which Protestant German was guilty, as a criminal and cowardly evasion of a vital decision, whic delay could only make more difficult. The artificial perpetuation o spiritual principalities only served to buttress the Habsburg power an postpone the achievement of national unity. In the other scale a Catholi would place the fact that to the rescue of the ecclesiastical Electorate from the rising tide of Protestantism must be attributed in no smal measure the hold which Catholicism still retains on western Germany.

This lame and halting conclusion of nearly forty years' strife has bee hailed as the birth of religious liberty; but it is mockery to describ the principle which underlay the Peace of Augsburg as one of toleration

Cujus regio ejus religio is a maxim as fatal to true religion as it is to freedom of conscience; it is the creed of Erastian despotism, the formula in which the German territorial Princes expressed the fact that they had mastered the Church as well as the State. Even for Princes religious liberty was limited to the choice of one out of two alternatives, the dogmas of Rome or those of Wittenberg. The door of Germany was barred against Zwingli, Calvin, and Socinus; and in neither the Lutheran nor the Roman Church was there the same latitude that there was in the Catholic Church of the Middle Ages. The onslaughts of her enemies compelled Rome to define her doctrines and to narrow her communion; if the Catholic Church was purified in the process, it was also rendered more Puritan; it became exclusive rather than comprehensive, Roman rather than Catholic. To define the faith is to limit the faithful; the age was one of definitions, and it destroyed for ever the hope of a real Catholicism.

But even this meagre liberty of choice between two exclusive communions was denied to the mass of the German people. For them the change consisted in this, that instead of having their faith determined for them by the Church, it was settled by their territorial Princes; instead of a clerical, there was a lay persecution; instead of a remote prospect of being burnt, the German dissenter, after 1555, enjoyed a much more imminent prospect of being banished; for the tyranny of Wittenberg, if it was less than that of Rome after the Council of Trent, was certainly greater than that of the Catholic Church before the appearance of Luther. Luther enunciated the principle of religious liberty, of individual priesthood. But he and his followers imposed another bondage, which went far to render this declaration ineffectual. The chief actual contribution of the Lutheran Reformation to religious liberty was thus indirect, almost undesigned. It produced the first Church independent of Rome, and prepared the way for countless other religious communities, which, however narrowly they may define their individual formularies, tend by their number to enforce mutual toleration. Private morality has been evolved out of the conflicting interests of an infinite mass of individuals; international law depends upon the multiplicity of independent States; and the best guarantee for the freedom of conscience consists in the multitude and relative impotence of the Churches.

There is no more disappointing epoch in German history than the reign of Charles V; if in its course it shattered some idols, it also shattered ideals. It began full of hope, and the nation seemed young. There were plans for reforming the Church and renewing the Empire; no one dreamt of dividing the one and destroying the other. Yet such was the result. The Reformation began with ideas and ended in force. In the Germany of the sixteenth, as in that of the nineteenth century, an era of liberal thought closed in a fever of war; the persuasions of sweetness

and light were drowned by the beat of the drum and the blare of th trumpet; and methods of blood and iron supplanted the forces of reason No ideas, it was found, in religion or politics, could survive unless the were cast in the hard material mould of German territorialism.

The triumph of this principle is really the dominant note of the period Territorialism ruined the Empire, captured the Reformation, crushed th municipal independence of the cities, and lowered the status of th peasant. The fall of the imperial power was perhaps inevitable but it was hastened by Charles V. In the first place, his dynastic an Spanish policy weakened his authority as a national monarch; in th second, his adoption of the cause of the Church threw the Reformer into the arms of the territorial Princes. The success of the Reforma tion thus meant that of the oligarchic principle and the ruin of Germa monarchy. The Reformation of the Empire became incompatible wit the Reformation of the Church; and the seal on Charles' failure was se by the Diet of Augsburg, which, besides concluding a truce of religion removed the *Reichskammergericht*, the organisation of the Circles, an the preservation of the peace from the sphere of imperial influence Henceforward Germany was not a kingdom, but a collection of pett States, whose rulers were dominated by mutual jealousies. From th time of Charles V to that of Frederick the Great, Germany ceased t be an international force; it was rather the arena in which the othe nations of Europe, the Spaniard, the Frenchman, the Swede, the Pole and the Turk, fought out their diplomatic and military struggles.

The *Kaisertum* was but one of the Princes' victims; the *Burgertun* also fell before them. The vigorous city life of the Middle Ages wa a thing of the past; in many a German town the representative o the territorial sovereign domineered over the elect of the burghers interfered in their administration, and even controlled their finances On the shores of the Baltic the destruction of town independence in volved the loss of Germany's maritime power, and not till our ow day has this eclipse begun to pass. With the decay of civic life wen also the ruin of municipal arts and civilisation, and in its stead ther was only the mainly formal culture of the petty German Court. N age in Germany was more barren of intellectual inspiration than tha which succeeded the Peace of Augsburg. The internecine struggle of the reign of Charles V had exhausted all classes in the nation, an an era of universal lassitude followed: intellectually, morally, and poli tically, Germany was a desert, and it was called Religious Peace.

CHAPTER IX.

THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE.

The Reformation in France never developed into a national movement. Though the Protestants under the stress of persecution consolidated themselves into a powerful and well-organised party, they never formed more than a minority of the nation. The majority, whose attachment to the Catholic Church was stronger than their desire for her reformation, detested the Reformers as schismatics and separatists even more than as heretics. When the Protestant ranks were recruited by the accession of numerous political malcontents, a more worldly leaven pervaded the whole cause; the principle of passive resistance was abandoned, and an appeal to armed force became inevitable. The result was a succession of religious wars, which lasted, though not continuously, for more than thirty years. It was not till the beginning of the seventeenth century that France, once more at peace with herself, was able to work out on her own lines a Counter-Reformation.

Yet at the beginning of the sixteenth century nearly all enlightened men were agreed as to the necessity for Reform. The evils under which the Church in France laboured were those which prevailed elsewhere; rapacity and worldliness among the Bishops and abbots, ignorance in the inferior clergy, great relaxation of discipline, and, in some cases, positive immorality in the monasteries and nunneries; and as the result an ever-widening separation between religion and morality. The first of these evils was a favourite topic with the popular preachers of Paris, the Franciscans, Michel Menot and Olivier Maillard, and the Dominican, Guillaume Pepin. On the other hand, the everyday story of the period has more to say about the ignorance of the parish priests and the immorality of the friars. The Franciscans seem to have been especially unpopular. All ranks of the Church alike fell under the lash of Sebastian Brant's *Ship of Fools* and Erasmus' *Praise of Folly*, both of which were translated into French and widely read.

But Frenchmen can relish satire even of what they love, and the people were none the less sincere in their attachment to the Church because they applauded the sallies of the jester. This attachment was

all the stronger because it sprang as much from a national as from a religious feeling. Ever since the days of Philip the Fair France had maintained an independent attitude towards the Papacy. During the Avignon Captivity the Popes had been her obedient servants. At the Council of Constance it was two Frenchmen, Jean Gerson and Pierre d'Ailly, who were chiefly instrumental in bringing about the declaration that Councils are superior to Popes. The Pragmatic Sanction (1438), as has been related in the first volume, gave definite shape to the liberties of the Gallican Church, and, though during the reigns of Louis XI and Charles VIII it was more or less in abeyance, the position of the French Church towards the Papacy remained practically unaltered. Louis XII formally restored the Pragmatic; and in his contest with Pope Julius II skilfully made use of the popular poet, Pierre Gringore, to influence public opinion. In his famous tetralogy of *Le Jeu du Prince des Sots et Mère Sotte*, played at Paris on Shrove-Tuesday, 1511, the Pope was held up to open ridicule. Thus in France there were no motives of personal interest at work to make a revolt from Rome desirable. The effect of the Concordat, the substitution of which for the Pragmatic (1516) was the only reform that the Fifth Lateran Council gave to France, was to put the French Church under the authority, not of the Pope, but of the King.

But the change in the method of appointing Bishops and Abbots from canonical election to nomination by the Crown, which was the chief feature of the Concordat, while it put an end to the noisier forms of scandal in the elections, greatly increased what many regarded as the root of the whole evil, the non-residence and worldly character of the superior clergy. For Francis I found that the patronage of some six hundred bishoprics and abbeys furnished him with a convenient and inexpensive method of providing for his diplomatic service, and of rewarding literary merit. A large number of abbeys were held by laymen, and even Bishops were not always in orders; pluralism in an aggravated form was common; the case of Cardinal Jean of Lorraine has been noticed in an earlier chapter; his brother Cardinal, Jean du Bellay, at one time enjoyed the revenues of five sees and fourteen abbeys. Italians shared largely in the royal patronage, and in 1560 it was estimated that they held one-third of all the benefices in the kingdom. It was this new method of patronage which more than anything paralysed all attempts at reform. It was idle to talk of reform at the bottom when at the top every personal interest was bound up with the existing corruption.

An impulse to reform was clearly needed from without. This was furnished by the Renaissance. For it was inevitable that the spirit of free enquiry, which was the main characteristic of that movement, should also invade the domain of religious dogma and Church institutions, and that, penetrating here as elsewhere to the sources, it should apply itself

to the first-hand study of the book upon which dogma and institutions were ultimately based. It was inevitable also that the spirit of individualism which was another marked characteristic of the Renaissance should end in questioning the right of the Church to be the sole interpreter of that book, and in asserting boldly that the final test of all religion is its power to satisfy the needs of the individual soul.

The connexion between the two movements, the Renaissance and the Reformation, was especially close in France. In both alike the same man occupied an almost identical position, standing on a threshold which he never actually crossed. This was Jacques Lefèvre, a native of Étaples in Picardy (Faber Stapulensis). After taking his degree in Arts in the University of Paris, he studied for some time in Italy and then devoted himself to the teaching of Aristotle and mathematics. He was also a busy writer and edited various works, including Latin translations of most of Aristotle's works. Though his Latin was somewhat barbarous and his knowledge of Greek imperfect, his services were warmly recognised by younger scholars, many of whom were his pupils. In the year 1507, when he was about fifty, he abandoned secular learning entirely for theology, and in 1512 published a Latin translation of St Paul's Epistles, with a commentary. The book was remarkable in two ways; first because a revised version of the Vulgate was printed by the side of the traditional text, and secondly because it anticipated two of the cardinal doctrines of the Lutheran theology. Thus in the commentary on the First Epistle to the Corinthians Lefèvre asserts that there is no merit in human works without the grace of God; in that on the Epistle to the Hebrews he denies, though in somewhat less precise language, the doctrine of Transubstantiation, while admitting the Real Presence.

Lefèvre remained for some years after the publication of this book in the seclusion of the abbey of St Germain-des-Près at Paris, where his former pupil, Guillaume Briçonnet, was Abbot. His book, though it attracted the attention of the learned, passed otherwise unnoticed. It was not till 1519 that the spark which he had kindled was fanned into a flame by the dissemination of Luther's Latin writings, which were read eagerly at Paris. But it was Briçonnet who first put his hand to the practical work of reforming the Church in France. Appointed to the see of Meaux in 1516 he had, after an absence of two years at Rome on a special mission, returned full of zeal for the reformation of his diocese. It was in the prosecution of this design that towards the close of the year 1520 he summoned to Meaux his old tutor Lefèvre and certain of his friends and pupils, all noted for their learning and piety, and all sharing more or less in his theological views. Among them were François Vatable, eminent as an Hebrew scholar, Guillaume Farel, and Gérard Roussel. Another member of the group, Michel d'Arande, was already at Meaux. They met with great favour from the Bishop, and throughout his diocese carried on the work of "preaching Christ from

the sources" with vigour and success. The movement was watched with eager sympathy by the King's sister, Margaret, Duchess of Alençon, who had chosen the Bishop for her spiritual director and was at this time carrying on with him a voluminous correspondence.

In June, 1523, Lefèvre published a revised French translation of the four Gospels, the first instalment of a new translation of the whole Bible, which he had been urged to undertake by Margaret and her mother. The rest of the New Testament followed before the end of the year. Except in a few passages it was nothing more than a revision of Jean de Rély's Bible, itself almost an exact reproduction of the old thirteenth century translation; but its publication did much to spread the knowledge of the New Testament. Though the effect of Luther's writings in France was considerable, the French Reformers showed almost from the first a tendency to base their theology rather on the literary interpretation of the Scriptures than on the specially Lutheran doctrine of Justification by Faith. Moreover, the geographical position of France brought them naturally into closer relations with Bucer and Capito at Strassburg, and with Œcolampadius at Basel, than with Luther at Wittenberg.

For two and a half years the preaching at Meaux went on without molestation and then the storm-clouds began to gather. Already on April 15, 1521, the Faculty of Theology of the Paris University, commonly called the Sorbonne, had formally condemned Luther's writings, and on August 3 of the same year the Parliament of Paris had issued a proclamation that all those who had any of these writings in their possession should deliver them up under penalty of a fine or imprisonment. It was by virtue of this order that on June 16, 1523, the books of Louis de Berquin, a gentleman of Picardy, noted for his learning, were seized, examined, and censured as heretical. On October 15 the Bishop of Meaux, whose sole desire was to reform the Church from within, and who consequently had no sympathy with Luther's attitude of open revolt, issued two synodal decrees: one against the doctrines and books of Luther, and the other against certain heretical opinions which had been preached in his diocese touching prayers for the dead and the invocation of the Saints. The latter decree was probably aimed at Farel, whose fiery and logical mind had carried him further than his companions, and who had left Meaux after only a short sojourn to become the leader of an advanced section of the movement which denied the Real Presence and shewed generally an iconoclastic and uncompromising spirit. The other preachers were still protected by the Bishop in spite of the Paris Parliament. However, in March, 1525, an example was made in the person of a wool-carder, named Jean Leclerc, who having committed a fanatical outrage was whipped and branded, first at Paris and then at Meaux. A few months later he was burnt at Metz for a similar offence.

While Francis was a prisoner at Madrid the Queen-Mother, urged

by her first minister, Cardinal Antoine Duprat, and by her own anxiety to gain the support of the Pope, induced the Parliament to appoint a commission for the trial of Lutherans. Many persons were imprisoned; Lefèvre's translation of the New Testament was condemned to be burned; and proceedings were instituted against the Meaux preachers. They saved themselves by flight, finding a refuge at Strassburg in the house of Capito (October, 1525). In January, 1526, Berquin was imprisoned, and on February 17 a young bachelor of arts named Joubert was burnt at Paris for holding Lutheran doctrines.

On March 17 Francis returned from captivity; and on the very day of his arrival in France he sent an order for the Parliament to suspend all action against Berquin, who after considerable delay was set at liberty. Lefèvre, Roussel, and Arande, who still called themselves members of the Catholic Church, were recalled from exile, and Lefèvre was appointed tutor to the King's third son. In spite of the execution of Jacques Pauvan, one of the Meaux preachers against whom proceedings had been taken with the full approval of the King (August 28, 1526), the hopes of the Reformers began to rise; and, on the whole, up to the end of 1527 things seemed to be taking a turn in their favour. But on December 16 of that year the King, being in straits for money for the ransom of his sons, summoned an Assembly of Notables; and, when the representatives of the clergy accompanied their vote of 1,300,000 *livres* with a request that he would take measures for the repression of Lutheranism, he gave a ready assent.

An outrage on a statue of the Virgin at Paris (May 31, 1528) furnished him with an opportunity of proving his sincerity, and he took part in a magnificent expiatory procession. Not long afterwards Berquin was again brought to trial and found guilty of heresy. Francis left him to his fate, and he was burnt on April 17, 1529. "He might have been the Luther of France," says Theodore Beza, "had Francis been a Frederick of Saxony." Meanwhile an important provincial synod, that of Sens, had been sitting at Paris from February to October of 1528 under the presidency of Cardinal Duprat, the Archbishop of Sens, for the purpose of devising measures for the repression of heresy. Similar synods were held for the provinces of Bourges and Lyons.

For two and a half years after Berquin's death the King showed no favour to the Reformers. But in the autumn of 1532 another change in his religious policy began to make itself felt. The ever shifting course of his diplomacy had now brought him into a close alliance with Henry VIII and into relations with the Protestant Princes of Germany. It was perhaps significant of this change that Jean du Bellay who, like his brother Guillaume, was in favour of a moderate reform of the Church, was at this time appointed Bishop of Paris. During the whole of Lent, 1533, Gérard Roussel, at the instigation of Margaret, now Queen of Navarre, and of her husband, preached daily in the Louvre to

large congregations; and when Noel Beda and some other doctors of the Sorbonne ventured to accuse the King and Queen of heresy, and to stir up the people to sedition, Francis, on the matter being reported to him, issued from Melun an edict banishing the doctors from the city. The Queen of Navarre became in consequence highly unpopular with the orthodox, and, in a comedy played by the students of the College of Navarre on October 1, 1533, was with Roussel held up to ridicule under a thin disguise.

The desire of the King for the Pope's friendship led however to a fresh change of religious policy; and, as the result of the conference with Clement at Marseilles (October 1—November 12, 1533), Francis, while declining to join in a general crusade against the followers of Luther and Zwingli, agreed to take steps for the suppression of heresy in his own kingdom and received from the Pope a Bull for that purpose. An opportunity at once occurred for putting it into force. On November 1 the new Rector of the University of Paris, Nicolas Cop, in his customary Latin oration, enveloped in unmistakable terms the doctrine of Justification by Faith. It soon became known that this discourse had been written for him by a young scholar of Picardy, named Jean Cauvin, or, as he called himself, Calvin. The scandal was great; and the King on hearing of it immediately wrote to the Parliament enjoining it to proceed diligently against the "accursed heretic Lutheran sect." Within a week fifty Lutherans were in prison; and an edict was issued that anyone convicted by two witnesses of being a Lutheran should be burned forthwith "It will be like the Spanish Inquisition" wrote Martin Bucer

But the King's Catholic fever quickly cooled down. On January 24, 1534, he entered into a secret treaty with the German Protestant Princes; and when he returned to Paris in the first week of February the persecutions ceased. Evangelical doctrines were again preached in the Louvre. "I see no one round me but old women," was the complaint of a Sorbonne doctor from his pulpit; "all the men go to the Louvre." In the spring Guillaume du Bellay was sent for the second time on a mission to Germany, with the object of concerting with the German theologians some *via media* which should effect a reconciliation between the two religious parties. Accordingly he sent a request to Melanchthon to draw up a paper embodying suggestions which might serve as the basis for an oral conference. Melanchthon complied, and du Bellay returned to France with a paper, dated August 1, 1534, in which the various points in dispute were separately discussed and means of arranging them were suggested.

But these hopes of reconciliation were suddenly scattered to the winds by the rash act of some of the more fanatical Reformers. On the morning of October 18, 1534, the inhabitants of Paris awoke to find the walls of all the principal thoroughfares placarded with a broadside in

which the Mass and its celebrants were attacked in the coarsest and most offensive terms. Copies were also pasted up in Orleans and other towns, and one was even affixed to the door of the royal bedchamber at Amboise, where Francis was at the time residing. The people of Paris were thoroughly roused and frightened by what seemed to them a blasphemous outrage. The King was furious. A persecution began in Paris which far exceeded all its predecessors in rigour.

By the middle of November two hundred heretics were said to be in prison; before the end of the year this number was nearly doubled. By Christmas eight persons had been burned. Early in the following year (1535) the King returned to Paris, and on January 21 took part in a grand expiatory procession. This was followed by a public banquet, at which he made a long speech announcing once more his intention of exterminating heresy from his kingdom. The day of expiation closed with the burning of six more heretics. On January 25 seventy-three Lutherans, who had fled from Paris, were summoned by the town crier to appear before the Courts, or in default to suffer attainder and confiscation of their goods. Among these was the educational reformer, Mathurin Cordier, and the poet, Clément Marot. By May 5 there were nine more executions, making in all twenty-three. But the King was beginning to relent. On the death of the Chancellor, Cardinal Duprat (July 9), Francis appointed in his place Antoine du Bourg, who was favourable to the Reformers. On July 16 he issued an Edict from Coucy announcing that there were to be no further prosecutions except in the case of Sacramentarians and relapsed persons, and that all fugitives who returned and abjured their errors within six months should receive pardon. The reason for this milder attitude was that Francis was still angling for an alliance with the German Protestant Princes, and had renewed the negociations with Melanchthon. By the direction of Guillaume du Bellay, John Sturm, who held at this time a professorship at Paris, wrote both to Melanchthon and Bucer urging them to come to France for the purpose of a conference with the Paris theologians. Melanchthon consented; but the Elector John Frederick of Saxony refused to let him go, and the proposed conference had to be abandoned (August, 1535). At the same time the Sorbonne, to whom Melanchthon's paper of the preceding year had been submitted, expressed its entire disapproval of the project.

Bucer, however, still worked indefatigably on behalf of a reconciliation; and at the close of the year du Bellay was again in Germany, first assuring the diet of Protestant Princes assembled at Schmalkalden that his royal master had not burnt his Lutheran subjects from any dislike of their religious opinions, and then holding interviews with Melanchthon, Sturm, and others, in which he represented his master's theological views as differing not greatly from their own. It was all to no purpose. Princes and theologians alike had ceased to believe in the French King's sincerity.

Neither the Edict of Coucy, nor a similar Edict, somewhat more liberal, which was issued in May, 1536, had much effect in bringing back the exiles to France. The great majority preferred exile to abjuration. Thus while the cause of Protestantism in France lost in this way many of its most ardent supporters, on the other hand there fell away from it the timid and the interested, those who had no wish "to be burned like red herrings," and those who basked in the sunshine of the royal favour. Moreover the sympathies of moderate men, of men like Guillaume and Jean du Bellay, of Guillaume Budé and François Rabelais, were alienated by the iconoclastic outbursts of the Reformers. They were favourable to a reform of the Church by moderate means, but they were statesmen or humanists, and not theologians. Rabelais' *Gargantua*, which he must have finished just before the affair of the placards, contains several passages of a distinctly evangelical character. But in his later books we find him "throwing stones into the Protestant garden." Lastly, there was a small group who followed the example of the Queen of Navarre and her ally Gérard Roussel, now Bishop of Oloron, and, while still holding the chief evangelical doctrines, continued members of the Catholic Church and conformed to most of its ceremonial. Though this seemed to Calvin an unworthy compromise, it fairly represented the half-practical, half-mystical character of Margaret's religion and her adherence to a certain phase of the Renaissance.

Thus the affair of the placards and the resulting persecution had made too wide a breach between the two religious parties to admit of its being healed. Partly from the timidity of the leaders and partly from the rashness of the rank and file, the first or Evangelical phase of Protestantism in France had failed to bring about a reform of the Church. In the early part of the year 1536 the man, who had initiated the movement, the aged Lefèvre d'Étaples, died at Nérac. Almost simultaneously there appeared a work which was to inaugurate the second or Calvinistic phase of French Protestantism, Calvin's *Christianae religionis institutio* (March, 1536). Though little more than a sketch as compared with the form which it finally took, it was in essential points complete. It gave the French Reformers what they so greatly needed, a definite theological system in place of the undogmatic and mainly practical teaching of Lefèvre and Roussel. It gave them a profession of faith which might serve at once to unite their own forces and to prove to their persecutors the righteousness of their cause.

It is true that French Protestantism, in thus becoming Calvinistic, in a large measure abandoned the two leading principles of the movement out of which it had sprung, the spirit of free enquiry, and the spirit of individualism. But without this surrender it must in the long run have yielded to persecution. It was only by cohesion that it could build up the necessary strength for resistance. Thus the French Protestants hailed the author of the *Institutio* as their natural leader, as the organiser

of their scattered forces. Little wonder if during the next twenty-five years of their direst need they looked for consolation and support to the free city among the Alps and to the strong man who ruled it.

The new war with Charles V, which broke out in April, 1536, left the French King no leisure for the suppression of heresy. But after the truce at Nice and the interview with the Emperor at Aigues-Mortes (July 14, 1538) Francis began to address himself in earnest to his task. After two partial Edicts, the first addressed to the Parliament of Toulouse (December 16, 1538), and the second to the Parliaments of Toulouse, Bordeaux, and Rouen (June 24, 1539), he issued from Fontainebleau on June 1, 1540, a general Edict of great severity. It introduced a more efficient and rapid procedure for the trial of heretics, which, with a slight modification made by the Edict of Paris (July 23, 1543), enlarging the powers of the ecclesiastical Courts, remained in force for the next nine years. On August 29, 1542, another Edict was addressed to the Parliament of Toulouse, followed on the next day by a *mandamus* to those of Paris, Bordeaux, Dijon, Grenoble, and Rouen. The Parliament of Aix required no such stimulus. Meanwhile the Sorbonne had been engaged in drawing up twenty-six articles in which the true Catholic faith on all the disputed points was set forth. It was their answer to the French translation of the *Institutio* which Calvin had completed in 1541 from the second and greatly enlarged Latin edition. The articles were ratified by a royal Ordinance of July 23, 1543. The answer of the Parliament of Paris had been of a more material character. On July 1, 1542, it issued a long Edict concerning the supervision of the press, of which the first clause ordered all copies of the *Institutio* to be given up within twenty-four hours. On February 14, 1544, these were solemnly burnt, with other books, including several printed by Étienne Dolet. This was shortly followed by the publication of the first *Index Expurgatorius* issued by the Sorbonne, which was registered by the Parliament ten months later

In this policy of repression the King had the active support of four men; the Inquisitor-General, Matthieu Ory; the first President of the Parliament of Paris, Pierre Lizet, soon to become even more notorious as the President of the *Chambre Ardente*; the Chancellor, Guillaume Poyet, who had succeeded the moderate Antoine du Bourg on November 12, 1538; and foremost among them, the Cardinal de Tournon, now all powerful with the King, and practically his first minister. Though the Cardinal was a liberal patron of learning and letters, he was a relentless and untiring foe to the new religious doctrines. "He is worth to France an Inquisition in himself," said a contemporary. It is significant also that just at this time Francis lost one of his ablest and most enlightened ministers, and the French Reformers one of their best friends in Guillaume du Bellay, who died in January, 1543.

With such a man in power as the Cardinal de Tournon there was not

likely to be any slackness in the execution of the Edicts. The earlier half of the year 1541 was a period of special distress for the French Reformers; and throughout the years 1540 to 1544 constant additions were made to the roll of their martyrs. It is chiefly of isolated cases that we hear, at most of three or four at a time; there were no *autos-de-fé*. The stress of persecution had compelled the Reformers to practise prudence and secrecy, but each fresh execution added strength to the cause. One martyr made many converts.

The Peace of Crépy, September 18, 1544, with its vague provisions for the reunion of religion, and "for the prevention of the extreme danger" which threatened it, boded evil to the Reformers. The next year, 1545, memorable as the year in which the Council of Trent held its first sitting, is also memorable for an act which has left a dark stain on the history of France and the Church, the massacre of the Waldenses of Provence. In 1530 these peaceful followers of Peter Waldo, who dwelt in about thirty villages along the Durance, having heard of the religious doctrines that were being preached in Germany and Switzerland, sent two envoys to some of the leading Reformers to lay before them their own tenets, and to submit to them forty-seven questions on which they were desirous of instruction. They received long answers from Œcolampadius and Bucer, and in consequence held in September, 1532, a conference of their ministers at Angrogne in Piedmont, at which they drew up a confession of faith chiefly based on the replies of the two Reformers. They also agreed to contribute five hundred gold crowns to the printing of the new French translation of the Scriptures which was in contemplation. This affiliation of their sect to the Lutheran heresy naturally attracted the attention of the ecclesiastical authorities. Accordingly Jean de Roma, the Inquisitor of the Faith for Provence, who had already begun to exhort the Waldenses to abjure their heresy, set on foot a cruel persecution.

The unfortunate Waldenses appealed to the King, who sent commissioners to investigate the matter. Roma was condemned, but escaped punishment by flight to Avignon (1533); and the Waldenses, profiting by the comparative favour that was shown to the Reformers at this time, considerably increased in number. But in 1535 the Archbishop and Parliament of Aix renewed the persecution, and on November 18, 1540, the Parliament issued an order, afterwards known as the *Arrêt de Mérindol*, by which seventeen inhabitants of Mérindol and the neighbourhood, who had been summoned before the bar of Parliament and had failed to appear, were sentenced to be burned. Owing however to the action of the First President the order was not put into immediate execution; and, the matter having come to the King's ears, he ordered Guillaume du Bellay, his Lieutenant-General in Piedmont, to make an enquiry into the character and religious opinions of the Waldenses. As the result of this enquiry the King granted a pardon to

the condemned, provided that they abjured their errors within three months (February 8, 1541). The order was still suspended over their heads when at the close of 1543 Jean Meynier, Seigneur d'Oppède, a man of brutal ferocity, succeeded to the office of First President of the Parliament of Aix. The Waldenses again appealed to the King and were again protected (1544). Accordingly the Parliament despatched a messenger to the King with the false statement that the people of Mérindol were in open rebellion and were even threatening Marseilles. With the help of the Cardinal de Tournon they obtained upon this statement new letters-patent from the King revoking his former letters, and ordering that all who were found guilty of the Waldensian heresy should be exterminated (January 1, 1545) The decree was kept secret until an army had been collected; and then, on April 12, Oppède, who, in the absence of the Governor of Provence was acting as his deputy, called together the Parliament, read the decree, and appointed four commissioners to carry it into execution. Within a week Mérindol, Cabrières, and other villages were in ashes; and at Cabrières alone eight hundred persons, including women and children, are said to have been put to death. The work of destruction continued for nearly two months, and in the end it was computed that three thousand men, women, and children had been killed, and twenty-two villages burned, while the flower of the men were sent to the galleys. Many of the survivors fled the country to find a refuge in Switzerland.

If the execution of the "Fourteen of Meaux" falls far short of the massacre of the Vaudois as regards the number of its victims, its strictly judicial character makes it more instructive as an example of the treatment of heretics. In the year 1546 the Reformers of Meaux organised themselves into a Church after the pattern of that set up by the French refugees at Strassburg eight years before. They chose as their first pastor, a wool-carder, named Pierre Leclerc, a brother of the man who was burnt at Metz. Their number increased under his ministry, and the matter soon came to the ear of the authorities. On September 8 a sudden descent was made on the congregation, and sixty persons were arrested and sent to Paris to be tried by the Parliament. Their greatest crime was that they had celebrated the Holy Communion. On October 4 sentence was pronounced. Fourteen were sentenced to be tortured and burned, five to be flogged and banished; ten, all women, were set free, while the remainder were to undergo graduated forms of penance. The sentences were carried out at Meaux on October 7. Étienne Mangin, in whose house the services had always been held, and Leclerc, were carried to the stake on hurdles, the rest on tumbrils. They had all previously undergone what was known as "extraordinary" torture, and all had refused to reveal the names of other Reformers at Meaux. At the stake six yielded so far as to confess to a priest, thereby escaping the penalty of having their tongues cut out; the others who remained firm suffered

this additional barbarity, which it was the custom to inflict on those who died impenitent. The congregation at Meaux was thus broken up, but the survivors carried the evangelical seeds to other towns in France.

The "Fourteen of Meaux" were not the only victims of the year 1546. Five others had already been burned at Paris, including the scholar and printer Étienne Dolet. Others were burned in the provinces. The next year, 1547, opened with fresh executions; and on January 14 the mutilation of a statue of the Virgin was expiated by a solemn procession at Paris

Such was the policy which Francis I began definitely to adopt towards Protestantism after the affair of the placards, and which he put into active execution during the last seven years of his life. How far was it successful? As we have seen, it drove a large number of persons into exile; and these consisted chiefly of the better-born and better-educated among the Reformers. It intimidated many into outward conformity with the Church. It prevented all public exercise of the Reformed religion, and all open propaganda. Religious meetings were held by night or in cellars; doctrines were spread by secret house-to-house teaching, or by treatises concealed amongst the wares of pretended pedlars. On the other hand the frequent executions helped to spread the evil they were meant to repress. The firm courage with which the victims faced death did as much as the purity of their lives to convert others to their faith. Moreover, the influence of the exiles reacted on their old homes. From Geneva and the other Swiss centres of Protestantism missionaries came to evangelise France.

The result was that there was no longer a province in France, except Britanny, in which Protestantism had not acquired a foothold. In all the large towns it had been established at an early date. In Lyons, the most enlightened town of France, the Lutherans were already described in 1524 as "swarming." At Bordeaux, where the first seed had been sown by Farel, the preaching of a Franciscan, Thomas Illyricus, in 1526, had produced a rich harvest; and the revival in 1532 of the old College of Arts under the name of the College of Guyenne had done much to foster the movement. Rouen was deeply infected in 1531 and thence the contagion spread to other parts of Normandy and to Amiens in Picardy. Orleans became an important centre, partly through the influence of Melchior Wolmar, who lived there from 1528 to the end of 1530. Even at Toulouse, where the University had been founded as a bulwark of orthodoxy, and on the whole had fully maintained its reputation, the new doctrines could not be kept out, and in 1532 Jean de Caturce, a young licentiate of laws, was burned at the stake.

Other Universities contributed to the spread of Evangelical teaching; Poitiers, Angers, Bourges, and especially Nismes, the new foundation of Margaret of Navarre, the rector of which was the well-known humanist

Claude Baduel, an avowed Protestant. At Poitiers one of the professors of theology, Charles de Sainte Marthe, openly taught the new doctrines till, a persecution breaking out in 1537, he had to fly for his life. Protestantism was also rife at Loudun and Fontenay, and before long spread to Niort and La Rochelle. Poitou became the stronghold of French Protestantism. Other provinces to which it gained admission at an early date were Dauphiné, where Farel had preached in 1522, and the Vivarais, in which Annonay near the Rhone became an important centre.

As was natural, the water-ways of the great rivers helped to spread the movement. On the Loire there was hardly a town from Le Puy to Angers which it did not reach, while between Orleans and Tours it took a firm hold. It worked up the Sarthe to Le Mans and Alençon, and up the Allier to Moulins and Issoire. It penetrated the Limousin by the Vienne and La Marche by the Creuse. It made its way along the Seine from Rouen to Troyes and along the Yonne to Sens and Auxerre. From Lyons it travelled down the Rhone to Tournon, and up the Saône to Mâcon and Châlons. At Dijon, the old capital of the duchy of Burgundy, a Lutheran was executed in 1530, and soon afterwards a pastor was sent there from Geneva. Agen on the Garonne formed a connecting link between Bordeaux and Toulouse; Sainte Foy and Bergerac were reached by the Dordogne, and Villeneuve by the Lot. The preaching of Philibert Hamelin at Saintes has been described in a well-known passage by his fellow-Protestant Bernard Palissy; thence it spread up the Charente to Cognac and Angoulême.

This then was the result of the repressive policy which Francis I had carried out with more or less consistency for ten years. The outward manifestation of Protestantism was indeed kept under, though not without difficulty; but the work of propagandism went on in secret, until nearly the whole of France was covered with a network of posts which, insignificant enough at present, were ready at a favourable opportunity and with proper organisation to become active centres of a militant Protestantism. But a change was now impending in the government of France. At the end of January, 1547, Francis I was seized with a serious illness, which terminated fatally on the 31st of March. He was succeeded by his only surviving son, under the title of Henry II.

Henry's policy towards the Protestants from the first was far more uniformly rigorous than his father's. It was not biassed either by sympathy with humanism, or by the necessity of conciliating his Protestant allies. Moreover it was the one point of policy upon which all his advisers were agreed. Here the opposing influences of Montmorency and Guise united in a common aim. In the very first year of his reign a second criminal Court of the Parliament of Paris was

created for the trial of heretics (October 8, 1547). It became known as *la Chambre Ardente*, and fully deserved its name. From the beginning of December, 1547, to January 10, 1550, it must have condemned to death at least a hundred persons, belonging for the most part to the class of smaller shopkeepers and artisans, and that although its jurisdiction was confined to a quarter of France. The provincial Parliaments, especially those of Rouen, Toulouse, and Aix, were no less active. Owing to the jealousy of the ecclesiastical Courts the sole right of trying cases of heresy was restored to them by an Edict of November 19, 1549, and the *Chambre Ardente* was temporarily suppressed. But the ecclesiastical Courts continued to show remissness; and a new Edict was issued from Châteaubriand on June 27, 1551. It transferred to the civil Courts the cognisance of heretical acts which involved a public scandal or disturbance, and encouraged informers by the promise of a third of the accused's property. Fresh executions in various parts of France showed that the judges were more to be relied on than the Bishops. In March, 1553, the *Chambre Ardente* was revived, and soon afterwards an execution took place at Lyons which made a deep impression on the public mind. It was that of the "Five Scholars of Lausanne." Natives of different places in the south-west of France, they had gone to Lausanne to prepare themselves by study for the work of evangelisation. One had lodged with Beza, another with Viret. On their return home they were arrested at Lyons (May 1, 1552) and condemned to death for heresy by the ecclesiastical judge. Having appealed to the Parliament of Paris, they were kept for a whole year in prison awaiting its decision. Beza, Pierre Viret, the Cantons of Zurich and Bern, interceded in vain with the King and with the Cardinal of Tournon. The scholars were burnt on May 16, 1553 They had been guilty of no crime except that of heretical opinions, they had committed no act which could possibly be construed as dangerous to the public peace or to the orthodox religion. Their execution made a deep impression, and the account of it fills a large space in Crespin's *Martyrology* which appeared in the following year (1554), and immediately took rank with the Protestant Bible and the Protestant Psalter as a cherished source of inspiration and support in persecution.

In the year 1555 French Protestantism took a definite step forwards. It began to organise its Churches. It is true that before this date Churches had been established at Meaux (1546) and Nismes (1547), but they had both been broken up by persecution. Now Paris set the example. The Church was organised, as that of Meaux had been, on the model of that of Strassburg, founded by Calvin in 1538. Jean le Maçon, surnamed Le Rivière, was chosen as pastor, and he was assisted in the work of government by a consistory of elders and deacons. In the same year Churches were organised after the same pattern at Angers, Poitiers, and Loudun, and in the little peninsula of Arvert, between

the Gironde and the Seudre. In the following year (1556) were added Blois and Montoire in the Orléanais; Bourges, Issoudun, and Aubigny in Berry; and Tours; while the Church of Meaux was refounded in the same year. The Churches of Orleans and Rouen date from 1557, and as many as twenty were established in 1558, including Dieppe, Troyes, Bordeaux, La Rochelle, Toulouse, and Rennes. This important work was due largely to the instigation of Calvin, and was carried out under his supervision. During the eleven years from 1555 to 1566 no less than 120 pastors were sent from Geneva to France. Geneva was in fact now regarded as the capital of French Protestantism; French refugees had gone there in increasing numbers, and had contributed to Calvin's definite triumph over his opponents in the very year, 1555, in which the French Churches began to be organised.

Meanwhile the French government was devising a more powerful engine for the suppression of Protestantism. At the instance of the Cardinal of Lorraine Edicts were drawn up establishing an Inquisition after the Spanish pattern. They were submitted to the Parliament of Paris early in the year 1555, but the Parliament refused to register them, and when Pierre Séguier, one of the presidents *à mortier*, appeared before the King to justify its action (October 22, 1555) he spoke with such convincing eloquence that the matter was dropped for a time. But in 1557 Henry, finding the existing machinery for the suppression of heresy still insufficient, obtained a papal brief authorising the proposed step. To this was joined a diploma appointing the Cardinals of Lorraine, Bourbon, and Châtillon as Inquisitors-General (April 25, 1557). As, however, the Parliament refused to recognise it, the brief remained inoperative, and the King had to content himself with a new Edict against heresy which was issued from Compiègne on July 24.

Before it was registered (January 15, 1558) a fresh persecution broke out. The defeat of St Quentin (August 10) had thrown Paris into a paroxysm of unreasoning terror, which was repeated on the news of the surrender of the town (August 27). On the evening of September 4 a congregation of three or four hundred Protestants, which had assembled for worship in a large house in the Rue St Jacques, was attacked by a furious mob. The majority of the men, many of whom were armed, forced their way out, but the rest remained in the building till the arrival of a magistrate and an armed force, when they were carried off to prison. As a result of the investigations which followed, seven persons, including a young married lady of rank, were burned. There were also some high-born ladies among those prisoners who were eventually released. The fact is significant. During the last few years Protestantism, which at first affected mainly the artisan class, had begun to spread among the higher ranks of society, and it now received some notable accessions. François d'Andelot, the youngest of the Châtillon brothers, became a Protestant during his imprisonment at Melun (1551–6), and

the imprisonment of Gaspard de Coligny after the fall of St Quentin had the same result. About the same time Antoine de Bourbon, the titular King of Navarre, who was the next in succession to King Henry II and his sons, joined the ranks of the Reformers. He was followed by his brother Louis, Prince of Condé.

The most active of these converts was d'Andelot. In April, 1558, he visited his wife's large estates in Britanny together with one of the Paris pastors, Gaspard Carmel, and thus helped to spread Protestantism in that remote and conservative province. But soon after his return to Paris he was arrested by the King's order, and confined at Melun for two months. The immediate cause of his arrest was his alleged presence in the Pré-aux-Clercs, where, for five successive evenings (May 13–17), a large concourse of persons of all ranks had assembled to take part in the singing of Marot's Psalms. The psalm-singing was stopped, but it made a considerable stir, for as many as five or six thousand were said to have taken part in it. The Protestants, it was evident, were increasing rapidly in numbers as well as in importance. Calvin, writing on February 24 in this year, says that he had been told by a good authority that there were 300,000 Protestants in France.

In the following year, 1559, another important step was taken. On May 26 the first Synod of the French Protestant Church was opened at Paris. We do not know how many deputies were present, but apparently there were representatives of a considerable proportion of the forty to fifty Churches then constituted, though doubtless in some cases the same deputy represented several Churches. There was also a lay element consisting of elders. The pastor of the Paris Church, François Morel, was chosen as president. The outcome of the Synod, which transacted its business in haste and secrecy, was a scheme of Church government or "Discipline," and a Confession of Faith. The "Discipline," which was based on the principle of the equality of the individual Churches, recognised the already prevailing organisation in each Church, namely the pastor and the consistory of elders and deacons. The election to the consistory being by co-optation, the government was practically an oligarchy. It remained to weld together the various Churches into a united whole. This was done by instituting first an assembly called a Colloquy, which bound together a group of neighbouring Churches, then above this a Provincial Synod, and finally, to crown the edifice, a National Synod.

The Confession of Faith was based on one drawn up by Calvin and sent to the King of France towards the close of 1557. Though Calvin was opposed to any Confession being issued by the Synod, in case they should persist in their intention, he sent to them an enlarged form of his former Confession, and this with a few alterations and some additions was adopted. The language of it is singularly clear and noble, and is doubtless Calvin's own.

A few days after the close of the Synod the King attended a meeting of the whole Parliament of Paris. It was an unusual proceeding on his part, but the occasion was a special one, namely the adjourned consideration of the whole religious question, which had been recently discussed in a *Mercuriale*, or Wednesday sitting, held at the end of April. Many speakers opposed the repressive policy of the government, the boldest being Anne du Bourg, nephew of the former Chancellor, Antoine du Bourg, who advocated the suspension of all persecution of "those who were called heretics." Henry was highly incensed at the plain speaking of the counsellors, and had du Bourg and three others arrested. He vowed that he would see du Bourg burned with his own eyes. But on the last day of June, at the jousts in the Tournelles held in honour of the approaching marriage between Philip of Spain and Elizabeth of France, Henry was mortally wounded above the right eye by the broken lance of his antagonist, Gabriel de Montgomery, the captain of his Scottish guard. He died on July 10, 1559.

The accession to the throne of a sickly boy, Francis II, threw all the power into the hands of his wife's uncles, the Guises. The Queen-Mother made common cause with them, and the Constable and Diane de Poitiers were driven from the Court. "The Cardinal," wrote the Florentine ambassador, "is Pope and King." There was a widespread feeling of discontent. Though the King, being fifteen, had attained his legal majority, it was urged that his weak understanding made a Council of Government necessary, and that this Council ought to consist, according to custom, of the Princes of the Blood. The Guises were unpopular as foreigners, and the Cardinal of Lorraine was hated on his own account. Even the measures which he took for the much-needed improvement of the finances—the public debt amounted to over forty million livres and there was an annual deficit—added to his unpopularity. An active element of discontent was furnished by the younger sons of the nobility, whose only trade was war, and who were pressing in vain for their arrears of pay. To the Protestants the Cardinal's rule was a natural source of apprehension. He was known to be a thoroughgoing opponent of heresy and an advocate of the severest measures of repression. At first the Reformers had hopes in Catharine, but these were soon disappointed. She had no power apart from the Cardinal. Severe persecutions were set on foot, and Paris began to have the air of a captured city. In September Calvin was consulted as to whether persecution might be resisted by force. His answer was unfavourable, but, whatever effect it may have had on his co-religionists as a body, the political agitation continued. The execution of Anne du Bourg (December 23, 1559), his speech on the scaffold, his resolute bearing, made a profound impression, not only on Protestants but on Catholics. "His one speech," wrote Florimond de Rœmond, who was an eyewitness

of his execution, "did more harm to the Catholic Church than a hundred ministers could have done." The malcontents increased in number, but they lacked a leader. Their natural leader, the King of Navarre, was too unstable and irresolute. His brother Condé promised them his secret support provided their enterprise was limited to the capture of the Guises. When that was effected he could come forward. Meanwhile an acting leader was found in a Protestant gentleman of Périgord, Godefroy de Barry, Seigneur de la Renaudie, whose brother-in-law, Gaspard de Heu, a patriotic citizen of Metz, had recently been strangled by order of the Guises without form of trial in the castle of Vincennes. A large meeting of noblemen and others was held secretly at Nantes on February 1, 1560; and it was agreed that the arrest of the Guises should take place at Blois on March 6. Finding however before this date that the Court had already left Blois for Amboise the conspirators altered it to the 16th. Already on February 12 the Cardinal had been informed, in somewhat vague terms, of the existence of the plot. On his arrival at Amboise ten days later he received more precise information. The Duke of Guise took measures accordingly; several small bands of conspirators were captured; Jacques de la Mothe, Baron de Castelnau, a Gascon nobleman, who had seized the castle of Noizay near Amboise, capitulated on a promise of pardon; and finally la Renaudie himself was killed in a skirmish (March 19). Summary vengeance was taken on the prisoners; some were hanged, some beheaded, some flung into the Loire in sacks. Castelnau, who was honoured with a form of trial, was executed on March 29. The Chancellor, François Olivier, who had presided at his trial, died on the following day.

The Tumult of Amboise, as it was contemptuously called, had been rashly designed and feebly executed. But its barbarous suppression increased the unpopularity of the government and the disorder in the state of the kingdom. In April and May there were frequent disturbances in Dauphiné and Provence. In Dauphiné, where the Bishop of Valence, Jean de Montluc, and the Archbishop of Vienne, Charles de Marillac, were in favour of toleration, the Protestants had an able leader in Montbrun. In Provence Protestantism was spreading rapidly, and, at a conference held at Mérindol on February 15, 1560, sixty Churches were represented. Here also there was an active and resolute leader in the person of Antoine de Mouvans. Meanwhile the hatred of the Guises found vent in numerous pamphlets, one of which has become almost a classic. It was entitled a "*Letter sent to the Tiger of France*," and was written by the distinguished jurist, François Hotman.

It was evident that some change must be made in the policy of the government. Catharine saw her opportunity of checking the power of the Guises. By her influence Michel de l'Hôpital was made Chancellor, and, though the formal decree of his appointment was not drawn up till June 30, he assumed the duties of his office on his arrival at Paris

early in May. His first step was to secure the passing of the Edict of Romorantin (May 18, 1560), which restored to the Bishops the sole cognisance of cases of simple heresy, and imposed penalties on false accusers. In spite of its apparent severity it was in reality milder than that of Compiègne, for it allowed several stages of appeal. Moreover it obviated the introduction of the Inquisition. It was also by the advice of the Chancellor, supported by that of Coligny, that Catharine called together an Assembly of Notables, which met at Fontainebleau on August 21. Among the speakers were the two prelates, Montluc and Marillac. They both deprecated extreme measures of repression and warmly advocated two remedies, the reformation of the morals and discipline of the clergy, and either a General or a National Council.

Still more important was the attitude of Coligny. At the very opening of the second session he presented a petition from the Protestants, in which, after protesting their loyalty to the King, they begged that the prosecutions might cease and that "temples" might be assigned to them for worship. There were no signatures, but Coligny, when it came to his turn to speak, declared that he could have obtained 50,000 names in Normandy alone. He went on to advocate warmly the proposals of Montluc and Marillac. Thus the wisest statesman in France stood boldly forward as the champion of the Protestants. The assembly broke up on August 25, and on the following day the Estates were summoned for December 10 and an assembly of the clergy for January 20. Meanwhile all prosecutions for simple heresy, apart from sedition, were to cease.

Hardly had this decision been announced when information was received of a fresh plot, in which not only Navarre and Condé but the Constable and other Catholic nobles were implicated. Its exact nature remains a mystery, but it seems clear that a general rising in the South of France under the leadership of the Bourbon Princes was contemplated. Calvin knew of it, but apparently hoped that if a sufficiently imposing demonstration were made bloodshed would be averted. With this object Beza had gone to Nérac to urge the King of Navarre to put himself at the head of the movement. A relative of Condé's, Jean de Maligny, did actually seize part of Lyons, but from want of proper support had to retire (September 5). Throughout the months of September and October the Court was agitated with news of disturbances in the provinces, especially in Languedoc. As the result of Catharine's fears the Guises regained their ascendancy, and made it their first object to get possession of the persons of Navarre and Condé, both of whom had declined an invitation to the assembly of Fontainebleau. They were peremptorily summoned to Court, and towards the end of September set out to obey the summons. Rejecting the urgent invitations which they received on the way to put themselves at the head of an armed force they arrived at Orleans, where the Court now was, on October 30. Condé was immediately arrested, and Navarre, though left at liberty,

was closely watched. On November 26 Condé was condemned to death and his execution was fixed for December 10. More than one attempt was made to assassinate the King of Navarre; and there were vague rumours that the Cardinal intended to remove by death or imprisonment all the leaders of the opposition. But his scheme, whatever it was, was frustrated by the young King's death, after a brief illness, on December 5.

During the short reign of Francis II a great change had been wrought in the character of French Protestantism. Though still purely religious in its aims it had become imbued with a political element. The fact that the natural leaders of the opposition to the Guises were Protestants made this inevitable. It was both an evil and a gain—an evil because it brought into the Protestant ranks men whose only Protestantism consisted in offering the grossest insults to forms of religion consecrated by long usage and deep-rooted in the affections of the people; a gain, because henceforth Protestantism, powerful in the numbers, quality and organisation of its adherents, and led by men of the highest rank in the kingdom, became a force in the State. To this new condition of things corresponded a new name, that of Huguenot. Its precise origin is uncertain, but recent research has shown that it is at any rate purely French.

The death of Francis II brought the Guise domination to an end. His successor, Charles IX, was only ten years old, and therefore unquestionably a minor. There was no longer the influence of a wife to overshadow that of the mother, and the right to the Regency belonged by custom to the King of Navarre. But just before the late King's death Navarre had renounced, so far as he legally could, this right in favour of Catharine, on condition that his position in the kingdom should be inferior only to hers. It was to Navarre therefore and the Constable, who was at once recalled to Court, that Catharine gave the chief place in her counsels; and it was upon Navarre that the hopes of the Huguenots were now centred.

The first event of the new reign was the meeting of the Estates at Orleans on December 13. The Chancellor in his opening speech deprecated persecution for religious opinions, and urged mutual toleration and the abandonment of offensive nicknames such as Papist and Huguenot. On January 1, 1561, the representatives of the three Estates made their speeches; and in the course of the next ten days the various *cahiers*, or written statements of grievances, were presented. Both the nobles and the Third Estate insisted strongly on the need for a reformation of the Church. As regards Protestantism the Third Estate pressed for complete toleration, while the clergy demanded vigorous measures of repression. The nobles, being divided in their opinions, presented three *cahiers* representing three groups of provinces. One group, consisting of the

central provinces, were in favour of rigid repression; another, formed by the western provinces and the towns of Rouen and Toulouse, demanded toleration; while the third group, composed of the Eastern provinces with Normandy and Languedoc, urged that both parties should be ordered to keep the peace and that only preachers and pastors should be punished. All three Estates alike demanded the abolition of the Concordat. On January 28 a royal Edict was issued ordering Parliament to stop all prosecutions for religion and to release all prisoners. On the 31st the Estates were prorogued till May 1 for the purpose of considering the financial question. The meeting of the clergy fixed for January 20 was dropped, in view of the General Council which the Pope had ordered to reassemble at Trent on Easter-Day. Meanwhile the answer of the government to the demands of the Estates was being embodied in a statute known as the Ordinance of Orleans which, though dated January 31, 1561, was not completed till the following August. The Concordat was abolished, and the election of the Bishops was transferred to a mixed body of laymen and ecclesiastics who were to submit three names to the King. Residence was imposed on all holders of benefices.

The Edict of January 28 and the general attitude of the government gave a considerable impulse to the Protestant movement. On March 2 their second national synod was held at Poitiers. At Fontainebleau during Lent Protestant ministers preached openly in the apartments of Coligny and of Condé; fasting was ostentatiously neglected; and the Queen-Mother and the King listened to sermons from Bishop Montluc in one of the state rooms of the palace. The mere fact of a Bishop preaching marked him as a Lutheran in the eyes of old-fashioned Catholics. The Constable, who went to hear Montluc once, came away in high dudgeon. His orthodoxy took alarm at this general encouragement of heretical doctrine and practice; and at a supper party at his house on Easter-Day (April 6) he formed with the Duc de Guise and St André a union which was afterwards known as the Triumvirate. As the result of success the Protestants became insolent and defiant. At Agen and Montauban they seized unused Catholic places of worship. In many towns the mob rose against them and the disturbances ended in bloodshed. At Beauvais, where the Cardinal de Châtillon was Bishop, there was a dangerous riot on Easter Monday, in consequence of which an Edict was issued on April 19 forbidding all provocation to disturbance. It remained a dead letter. At the end of the month a Paris mob having attacked the house of a Protestant nobleman was fired on by the defenders. The assailants fled, leaving several dead, and more wounded. On May 2 there were fresh disturbances. It was not till the middle of the month that the condition of the capital began to grow quieter. On May 28 the clergy of Paris presented a remonstrance on the conduct of the Protestants; and on June 11 the Protestants presented a petition asking for churches to be assigned to them or for permission to build them.

In their perplexity the government determined on a conference between the Council and the Parliament of Paris, to consider the means of putting an end to these disturbances. On June 18 the Chancellor opened the proceedings in a clear and impartial speech. The deliberations dragged on from June 23 to July 11. As the result a new Edict, known as the "Edict of July," was issued (registered July 31). All acts and words tending to faction or disturbance were forbidden. Attendance at any assembly at which worship was celebrated otherwise than according to the forms of the Catholic Church was to be punished by imprisonment and confiscation of property. The cognisance of cases of simple heresy was left to the ecclesiastical Courts. If the accused was handed over to the secular arm no penalty higher than banishment could be imposed. Finally it was stated that the Edict was only provisional, pending the decision of either a General or a National Council. In spite of this provisional character the Edict found no favour with either party. Both alike abused and ignored it.

On August 1 the prorogued meeting of the Estates, fixed originally for May, was opened at Pontoise. Only twenty-six deputies were present, thirteen for each of the two lay Estates; the deputies of the clergy were already in session at Poissy, where the ecclesiastical synod had begun to sit on July 28. It was not till August 27 that the *cahiers* were presented at a session held at St Germain at which the clerical deputies were also present. Both *cahiers* were remarkable for the boldness of their proposals. They included a total reform of the judicial system, and a transference of a share in the sovereignty to the Estates by making their consent requisite for war or for any new taxation. To meet the financial difficulties three proposals were made. The most thoroughgoing was one made by the Third Estate, that the whole ecclesiastical property of the kingdom should be nationalised, that the clergy should be paid by the State, and that out of the surplus of 72,000,000 *livres* thus obtained 42,000,000 should be devoted to the liquidation of the public debt. However enlightened this proposal may have been it was neither practical nor opportune. It completed the alienation of the Paris Parliament from civil and religious reform; and it led to an arrangement between the clergy and the Crown. Alarmed by the proposals for their spoliation the clergy offered the Crown a sum of 16,600,000 *livres*, to be paid in instalments spread over ten years. The offer was accepted.

With regard to the religious question the nobles and the Third Estate alike advocated complete toleration and the calling together of a National Council. Already on July 25 a proclamation had been issued inviting the Protestant ministers to the assembly at Poissy. It was to be a National Council in everything but the name. So much concession was made to the Pope and the King of Spain. Accordingly on September 9 the village of Poissy, three miles west of St Germain, celebrated

as the birthplace of St Louis, was the scene of unusual splendour. The Protestants were represented at the "Colloquy" (as it came to be called) by twelve ministers, including Beza, François de Morel, the president of the first National Synod, and Nicolas des Gallars, the minister of the French Protestant Church in London, and by twenty laymen. Six Cardinals, forty Archbishops and Bishops, twelve doctors of the Sorbonne, and as many canonists, represented the French Catholic Church. The King and the Queen-Mother, the rest of the royal family, the Princes of the Blood, and the members of the Council of State, completed the imposing assemblage.

The chief event of the first day was Beza's speech, which, both in matter and manner, made a deep impression. The Cardinal of Lorraine replied to it on September 16. Though his speech was contemptuously criticised by his theological opponents, it was skilfully adapted to his purpose of making a favourable impression on the unlearned majority of his audience. Both Coligny and Condé praised it. But even more than Beza's it was the speech of an advocate, and it concluded with a fervid appeal to the young King to remain in the faith of his ancestors. On September 19 Ippolito d'Este, the Cardinal of Ferrara, who enjoyed the revenues of three French archbishoprics, one bishopric, and eight abbeys, arrived at St Germain in the capacity of legate *a latere* from Pius IV, with instructions to use his influence to stop the conference. In his numerous suite was Laynez, the successor of Loyola as General of the Jesuit Order, whose college at Paris had been formally legalised by the assembly at Poissy four days before. Whether owing to the efforts of the legate or not, the last two meetings of the Colloquy, which were held on September 24 and 26 with greatly diminished numbers, were wasted in angry and useless discussion. The speech of Laynez on the 26th was especially uncompromising. Catharine however did not despair. She arranged a conference between five of the Protestant ministers and five of the Catholic clergy who favoured reform. Among the Protestants was the famous Peter Martyr, who had arrived at Poissy on the evening of September 9. The delegates met on September 30 and the following day. Having drawn up a formula relating to the sacrament of Holy Communion, they submitted it to the assembly of Bishops, by whom it was straightway rejected (October 9).

From Catharine's point of view the Colloquy had, as she said, borne no fruit. It had failed to bring about the religious unity which seemed to her essential to the pacification of the kingdom. On Sunday, October 12, there was a fresh tumult at Paris outside the gate of St Antoine; and several Protestants were killed or wounded. Moreover the outlook abroad was threatening. The Spanish ambassador, Thomas Perrenot de Chantonnay, told Catharine in his usual bullying tone that his master was ready to come to the assistance of her Catholic subjects. But the Queen-regent put on a bold front, and showed a determination

to be mistress in her own house. The Guises now left the Court (October 20), and were shortly followed by the Constable and the Maréchal de Saint André. The principal management of affairs passed into the hands of Coligny and the Chancellor. Never had the Protestants been so sanguine of success. Though the Colloquy had failed to produce the result which Catharine, and perhaps a few liberal Bishops, like Montluc, had expected, from the Protestant point of view it had been singularly successful. It had enabled the Reformers to publish *urbi et orbi* by the mouth of one of their ablest and most eloquent representatives a clear statement of their doctrines. It is true that by the so-called Edict of Restitution, issued on October 20, as an equivalent for the sixteen millions voted by the clergy, the Protestants were ordered to restore all the churches of which they had taken possession; but almost at the same time Beza persuaded the government to send letters to the provincial magistrates enjoining them to allow the Protestants to meet in security, and to interpret the Edict in a lenient spirit, pending a more definite settlement. Even in Catholic Paris the numbers attending the meetings reached 15,000. The demand for ministers was greater than Geneva could satisfy. On Michaelmas-day Beza had celebrated, according to the Protestant rite, the marriage of a young Rohan with the niece of Madame d'Étampes. There were rumours that several Bishops would shortly declare themselves Protestants; there were even hopes of the King.

Meanwhile the country was in a more disturbed state than ever. On November 16 there was a massacre at Cahors; every Sunday produced a disturbance at Paris, and the Feast of St John (December 27) was signalised by one of more than ordinary violence round the Church of St Médard. Partly in consequence of these outbreaks Catharine summoned a fresh conference to meet at St Germain on January 3, 1562. On the 7th the actual business began with a remarkable speech by the Chancellor in which, far in advance of his time, he enunciated modern principles of religious toleration. The question before them, he said, was a political, not a religious one; "a man may be a citizen without being a Christian." Those who had been summoned to the conference, thirty Presidents and Councillors chosen from the eight Parliaments and twenty members of the Privy Council including the Princes of the Blood, then gave their opinions in order. The King of Navarre's speech showed that he had virtually abandoned the Protestant cause. This step, to which his position rather than his character gave importance, had for some time been skilfully manœuvred by the Cardinal of Ferrara, who had dangled before the King various suggestions of compensation for the territory of Spanish Navarre, of which his wife's ancestor had been deprived by Ferdinand the Catholic. In the final voting the party of repression coalesced with the middle party, which thus obtained a small majority; and it was in the sense of their views that an Edict was drawn

up (January 17). By this Edict, known as the "Edict of January," which was declared to be provisional pending the decision of a General Council, the Protestants were ordered to give up all the churches and other ecclesiastical buildings in their possession, and were forbidden to assemble in any building, or to assemble at all within the walls of any city. With these limitations the right of assemblage free of molestation was granted to them. Thus Protestantism for the first time in France obtained legal recognition. The Protestants were far from satisfied, but, acting on the advice of their leaders, they accepted the compromise. The Catholics were less submissive. It was not till after a long and obstinate resistance that the Parliament of Paris registered the Edict on March 6. By that date the issue to which events had been inevitably tending had already declared itself. The religious war had begun.

CHAPTER X.

THE HELVETIC REFORMATION.

The Helvetic Reformation, like the German, was the outcome of both the national history and the Renaissance. The history of Switzerland had been a record of free communities in town or country, more than holding their own under changing local dynasties and weakening imperial power. Gradually a sense of national unity emerges, but earlier local connexions are long retained. The Teutonic communities of Uri, Schwyz, and Unterwalden separately gain their independence in ways common enough elsewhere, and then become the centre of the later confederation. The lands around them are divided into two strongly marked parts—a Burgundian west, looking towards France, Burgundy, and Savoy, converted by Gallic or Roman missionaries, divided among many dynasties, and a Swabian or Alamannic east, richer in civilisation and democratic cities, converted by Irish missionaries, looking by the run of its valleys and the lie of its plains towards Germany. This division lasts through the Frankish Empire and through the Middle Ages, and is the most essential feature in Swiss history.

The growth of the early Habsburg power, following the extinction of the House of Zaringen (1218), at first threatened the freedom of the Swiss; the connexion of the Habsburg House with the Empire gave it an imperial claim to jurisdiction in addition to the varied local claims it already possessed, though at the same time it absorbed its energy in other and more important fields. The tendencies to union shown by the German Leagues operated also among the Swiss communities, and in the end gave rise to the Perpetual League of the three Forest Cantons, Schwyz, Uri, and Unterwalden (August, 1291), with simple provisions for maintaining their primitive liberty and regulating their mutual relations. The League concluded at Brunnen on December 13, 1315, after the great battle of Morgarten, added nothing essential, although it bound the members more closely together against a usurping lord. The accidents of Habsburg history and the varied grouping of the neighbouring Powers kept this early league alive and even caused it to grow: victories against the Habsburgs and afterwards against Burgundy

confirmed its strength and increased its reputation. Soon cities with dependent villages under them, Luzern, Zurich, and Bern, joined the Confederates, and introduced divergent interests and policies. Around central Switzerland with its thirteen Cantons—those already mentioned, with Glarus, Zug, Freiburg, Solothurn, Basel, Schaffhausen, and Appenzell—there arose other leagues, the League of God's House among the subjects of the see of Chur, the Graubunden (or Grisons), and the League of the Ten Jurisdictions, differing in constitution and with histories of their own. In varying relations to the Confederation stood also dependent States (the Valais, the town and Abbey of St Gallen, and others.)

The Federal government not only gathered fresh members, but made conquests of its own: the Aargau (1415), partly divided between Bern and Zurich, partly, in the Free Bailiwicks, ruled jointly by the six Cantons (Zurich, Luzern, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Zug, and Glarus); the Thurgau, similarly ruled, but with special relations to Zurich. The government of these Common Lands was a difficult matter, as there was no Federal organisation beyond the Diet, to which the Cantons sent delegates. The Free Bailiwicks were administered by a Bailiff (*Landvogt*), appointed for two years by each of the six Cantons in turn. This defective system demanded perfect unity among the Confederates before it could work; and the chance of discord was greater because these Subject Lands lay between Zurich and Bern, and closed the path northwards from the Forest Cantons. To the south moreover conquests had been made towards Italy, and thus the Confederates were brought into touch with Italian as well as with German and more western politics.

Among the Confederates, Zurich (which joined them May, 1351) held a peculiar place. Favoured by Austria, and as an imperial city, Zurich had followed a distinct policy of its own which had at times led to war (for instance, 1442–50). What Bern, with its distinct aims and more aristocratic constitution, was to the west, Zurich, with its important gilds and widespread trade, was to the east. The Confederacy was again divided by the diversity of interests between rural and urban Cantons; moreover, city factions, as at Luzern, Zurich, and Bern, had looked to the Confederacy for help, and conversely civic disturbances could shake the Confederate League. The conquests from Austria, and the entanglement in the wars of France and Burgundy, and in those of Italy, involved the Confederacy in external relations out of all proportion to its constitutional growth. The problem of Federal organisation was handed down unsolved by the Middle Ages, together with conditions that made it difficult of solution.

Huldreich Zwingli was born on New Year's Day, 1484, at Wildhaus in the valley of Toggenburg. This district, after the extinction of its dynasty (1436), had been an object of strife between Zurich and Schwyz;

but in the end it had passed by purchase to the Abbey of St Gallen. The inhabitants of Wildhaus had gained the rights of electing their village bailiff and choosing their own village priest. Zwingli's father held the former, and his uncle Bartholomew the latter, office; when this uncle (1487) became rural dean and rector of Wesen on the Lake of Wallenstadt, the young boy, already destined for clerical life, went with him. His family was thus respected and versed in civil and ecclesiastical matters; on the mother's side, too, one uncle was Abbot of Fischingen, and another relative Abbot of Old St John's, near Wesen. In 1494 Zwingli was sent to Basel to be under Gregory Bünzli, and in 1498 to Bern, where his teacher was Heinrich Wolflin (Lupulus), then the most famous humanist in Switzerland. He was moved from Bern, lest the Dominicans should secure him as a novice, and he is next found at Vienna, where his classical bent was strengthened. In 1502 he returned to Basel where, in 1504, he graduated as Bachelor; the University was not then at its best, but the city was still a centre of Swiss life and of the trade in books; he became a teacher at St Martin's School, and thus his mind was early trained in the habit of instruction. In 1506 he was called to the charge of Glarus, an important town with three outlying hamlets, and was ordained priest at Constance.

The impulses forming his character had been simple: the democratic spirit of a self-governing village with traditions of its struggles—in 1490 he must have seen the Abbot of St Gallen appear with a small army to reduce his subjects to obedience; the training of the parish priest with a sense of responsibility (discharged as he even then significantly held mainly by preaching); the life of the village with its many activities of a smaller kind. But stronger than all these was his humanistic training, which at Glarus he had time to follow out. Traces of the current classical taste are seen in him to the end: one of these was his belief in the divine inspiration of Cato and other ancients with their high ideal of patriotism; hence, too, came his deep interest in the salvation of the great ancients who lived before Christ. But he was a humanist who never sought a patron.

Before he came to Glarus he had been under the influence of Thomas Wyttenbach (1505–6), a lecturer at Basel, from whom he had learnt the evils of Indulgences and the authority of the Bible. These crude ideas of reform were not however confined to Wyttenbach, and it was only in order to minimise his debt to Luther that Zwingli mentions this earlier indebtedness. But he had made closer acquaintance with Church abuses; for Heinrich Göldli, a Swiss of the Papal Guard and a trafficker in benefices, had bought the reversion of Glarus, and Zwingli had to pay him a pension of 100 *gulden* before entering upon his charge.

In classics Erasmus was his guide; good letters and sound theology were to go together; the spirit of the German Renaissance was to inspire theology; but of deep personal religion Zwingli at this stage was

ignorant. That he never went to rest at night without having read a little in his master's works, as he said in a letter to the master himself, may not have been strictly true; but the dominant influence of Erasmus upon Zwingli, never overcome although combined with other influences, admits of no doubt. He may also have learnt from Erasmus something in the way of negation, such as a contempt for relics; something, too, he may have learnt from Pico della Mirandola, for whose sake he was once called a heretic at Basel; but from anti-papal tendencies he was quite free. From this young humanist—paradoxically combining a deep sense of responsibility with notable laxity in his moral life—no programme of reform was as yet to be looked for. His was a mind that moved gradually towards its fuller plans, and needed a fitting field wherein to work.

In 1513 he had again taken up the study of Greek, in which a little later Bombasius became his teacher; and he went to the New Testament itself rather than to any commentaries; the Fathers however attracted him, and it was at Glarus that he read Jerome (to whom Erasmus could not fail to send him), Augustine, Origen, Cyril, and Chrysostom. Of all these Augustine was his favourite—a fact to be noted in discussing his theology; but he considered the Greek Fathers to be more excellent in their Christology than were the Latin. Hebrew, possibly begun before, was studied later at Zurich in 1519 or 1520, but needed a renewed effort in 1522. He ever insisted upon the need of a learned clergy, and studied Holy Writ as he had learned to study the classical writers—a method which lent freshness to his teaching, but laid him open to a charge of irreverence.

Through his devotion to Erasmus and his friendship with Heinrich Loriti of Glarus (Glareanus) Zwingli gained an entry into the world of letters, which inherited the cosmopolitanism of the medieval universities, and which was now beginning to group itself around presses such as Froben's at Basel and Froschauer's at Zurich (1519). This was of importance, not only for his growing reputation, but also as bringing him into touch with wider interests. In his later years of diplomacy the habit of correspondence and the varied associations thus formed proved of use. Equally important too was the skill with which he drew around him younger men—some to find their goal in humanism, some in religious reform; in their after life and in their studies (mainly at Vienna) he followed them from afar and regularly wrote to them. Thus before he founded a school he had the scholars ready, and his name was a power among the younger men.

During these years at Glarus he became entangled in that system of wars and pensions which was the glory and the shame of his fatherland. The Italian wars brought not only much wealth to Switzerland, but also an increase of territory. To keep the Swiss as allies Louis XII had (1503) surrendered Bellinzona to them; when Massimiliano Sforza was made

Duke of Milan (1512) they received from him the Val Maggia, Locarno, and Lugano, while the Rhaetian League (the Grisons) gained the Valtelline. The Swiss Diets were besieged by agents of the Powers. A French party was to be found in every town, and a papalist anti-French party was created by Matthäus Schinner, Cardinal of Sion, in the service of Julius II. Zwingli's interest in politics was great; politics and patriotism inspired his earliest German poems,—the *Labyrinth*, and the *Fable of the Ox and the Beasts*; his position in Glarus made him a valuable ally for the papal party in a parish where the French were strong; it was therefore natural—although afterwards made a charge against him—that he should accept from the Pope a pension of 50 florins (1512 or 1513); and he was also (August 29, 1518) appointed acolyte chaplain. So far was he from being anti-papal that the Papacy was the one Power with which he held it right, even dutiful, to form alliances. Twice he seems to have gone to Italy as chaplain with the Glarus contingent; according to Bullinger he was present at Novara (June 6, 1513) and at Marignano (September 13–14, 1515); on the latter occasion his persuasion kept the Glarus men faithful to their service when others deserted to the French. Afterwards he indicates this as the period when he formed his well-known views upon the evils of mercenary service. The life of a mercenary—in camp or city—destroyed the simplicity endeared to Zwingli by the earlier Confederate history and classic models.

In 1515 the papal alliance came to an end: the terrible experience of Marignano on the one hand, and the acquisition of territory on the other, had made the Confederates desirous of peace, and (November 29, 1516) a permanent peace was made with France. Zwingli's opposition to this change of policy made his position at Glarus untenable, and he became people's priest (or vicar) at Einsiedeln (April 14, 1516), placing a vicar at Glarus. Einsiedeln, owing to its renown as a place of pilgrimage, combined the quiet of a monastic House with the traffic of a place of passage. Here he carried further his classical studies and increased his reputation as a preacher; he carefully trained himself in oratory by a study of the best classic models.

The personalities of the three great leaders, Erasmus, Luther (to whom Zwingli considered he was prior in his teaching), and Zwingli, were very different. Luther, with his monastic training, cared little for Catholic organisation; but he had a fervid personal experience and a strong love for doctrine. Erasmus combined piety and theological learning with much freedom of speech, tempered by regard for authority and a historic sense. Zwingli had from the first no regard for authority—which indeed presented itself at times in a guise hard to respect; he belonged to a country peculiarly weak in its ecclesiastical organisation and abounding in clerical abuses. But he had a deep regard for learning and a love of freedom, personal and intellectual.

He had no vivid perceptions of dogma recording the struggles of the soul. But he learnt from his varied parochial experience to realise keenly the relations between a pastor and his people. He had no deep philosophic basis for his opinions, and he was no framer of theories; he needed the touch of actual life to bring his powers to work, and he needed a field that suited him before he could form a definite policy. So far he was a keen Swiss patriot, with that love of the past that had formed the legend of Tell, a humanist, and a Reformer of the type of Erasmus, if indeed he was a Reformer at all.

If he was correct in his own view of his mental history, he took up an anti-papal stand from the first, and not, as Luther did, pressed by the course of argument. "The Papacy must fall," he said to Capito in 1517. But the humanists had inherited something of scholastic freedom in discussion, and to call the papal authority in question was no new thing in 1517. There was little significance in this expression of opinion from one who held a papal pension, and had done his best to secure help for the Papacy in what many of its friends condemned—its Italian wars and temporal policy.

After refusing one post at Winterthur, he received the offer of another, that of people's priest at the Great Minster of Zurich. His reputation as a preacher was in his favour; the new Provost of the Chapter—Felix Frei—had humanistic sympathies, and the political views, which had made him enemies at Glarus, were not against him here, for similar views had friends at Zurich; foreign pensions had been forbidden by the *Pensionbrief* of 1503, and met with warm opposition in the Chapter; the French alliance also was of less importance here. His appointment was preceded by much negotiation; there were rivals, and a story was brought up to his discredit which he could neither in the main deny, nor yet adequately defend; indeed, the tone of his defence showed a lack of moral sense. Finally the influence of his friends, especially of Myconius (Oswald Geisshussler), schoolmaster at the Minster school, gained him the election (December 11, 1518), 17 out of a chapter of 24 voting for him. The office of people's priest or vicar at the Minster, thus gained, he kept until 1522; later he received a prebend after he had resigned his papal pension.

Zwingli had thus come to the proper field of his religious and political work. His development had so far been independent, not influenced even by Luther; and yet the movement begun by Zwingli owes much of its importance to that initiated by the German Reformer. Their likeness was the product of the time: their differences were not only doctrinal. Luther was no humanist, nor did his work lie in a Swiss city or in the Swiss Confederation. The special type of Protestantism presented to the world by Zwingli was due to his field of work being a city commonwealth with a peculiar history, political and ecclesiastical. But the ideas with which he started were the results of his humanism and of his previous work.

First among his ideas comes that of his prophetical office: he had gained his experience of life as a parish priest; his heart had gone into learning and education; these factors combined to form his vision of a prophet-pastor. From the Old Testament he took the notion of a prophet teaching morality, and not shrinking from politics where they had to be touched; but he added to this the ideal of instruction. He thus brought to his new work the loftiest conceptions of spiritual authority and responsibility. But his view left no room for other authority or for ecclesiastical superiors. The prophet was to do his work in the community,—not the community of the congregation regarded as part of a wider Church, but the political community in which he lived. Preaching—for which his life and training fitted him—was to be the means of teaching; it was well adapted for influencing a democracy and was characteristic of his system, where the pulpit superseded the altar, and where the intellectual element was large.

The relation of the prophet to his community was tinged by the influence of the Old Testament, and affected by the conditions of Swiss life. It was the prophet's work to teach, to inspire the magistracy; but it was theirs to carry out the policy. Thus he and they had to work together. This left large ecclesiastical powers to the community, and such the city had already claimed for itself; it gave wide scope to the personal influence of the pastor, both over the political assemblies and over the burgesses themselves. The acquisition of that influence, and the full use of it, were therefore essential to Zwingli's success.

Zurich had grown up around the Great Minster and the Minster of our Lady, foundations of Charles the Great and Ludwig the German respectively. The site was well adapted for trade, and, between the competing jurisdictions of the Abbess, the Provost of the Great Minster, and the Bailiff of the Emperor, a peculiarly free development was possible. There had been many contests between the city and its clergy. Arnold of Brescia, whose visit left traces, had sojourned there (1140–5); the liability of the clergy to pay taxes had been discussed and enforced. As a rule the monasteries were not only assessed for taxation, but subject to visitation by the State; and one of the few Federal documents that went into detail laid down the subjection of ecclesiastics to all ordinary jurisdiction (the *Pfaffenbrief* of 1370).

Swiss history—apart from legend—had been so far singularly poor in individual types. The most striking exception was that of Hans Waldmann, who had left a conspicuous mark on the constitution of Zurich. In 1483 he became Burgomaster, and for some years stood out as the leading statesman in Switzerland; foreign Powers gave him gifts and negotiated with him as with a prince. Though he was opposed by the aristocrats, he succeeded in carrying out a constitutional reform, excellent for the city, but stringent and oppressive for the surrounding villages.

Up to this time the *Constafel*, the original citizens, knights, merchants, and men of independent means, had been the leading element in the constitution. Rudolf Brun (1336) had placed the Gilds of handworkers, 13 in number, afterwards 12, alongside of the *Constafel*: their Masters became members of the smaller Council along with other Councillors, elected variously. At the head of the Constitution stood the Burgomaster, and for special purposes the Great Council of 200 (exactly 212) was called together. Waldmann, whose sympathies were with the Gilds, gave them more power in the constitution, and reduced the direct representation of the *Constafel* in the Smaller Council from 12 to 6. These civic regulations were confirmed even by his enemies after his execution; but discontent was caused by his strict enactments about trade and agriculture which weakened the country for the good of the city; the ill-will thus caused led to the riots preceding his death and left their mark behind. In the end the villages gained through the mediation of the other States an organisation (*Gemeinde*) of their own, through which they could act and consult with Zurich.

Waldmann claimed for the city the right to legislate for the Church, and to regulate the life and demeanour of ecclesiastics, and thus gave an impulse to the ecclesiastical independence of Zurich, already considerable. A document, dating from 1510 and often wrongly termed a Concordat, summed up the ecclesiastical powers claimed by Zurich and permitted to her by the Pope, anxious for such a useful ally. The diocesan divisions of Switzerland corresponded to no national limits and were included in different provinces—Constance and Chur under Mainz, Basel and Lausanne under Besançon, and Sion under Tarantaise, until freed by Leo X from its dependence. The Bishop of Constance, in whose diocese Zurich lay, was not well placed to assert his authority in this powerful city, and had seen many of his rights as to jurisdiction and appointments superseded.

When Zwingli went to Zurich, he therefore found a city democratic in its institutions (more so, for instance, than Bern), where a capable orator and man of affairs would be able to come to the front speedily, its history had made its relations with the Papacy and the Bishop mere matters of policy; the Church had as against the State little independence of its own, and there was no traditional dislike of change. For such a community he was well fitted: the political questions to which he had given most thought were those upon which opinion at Zurich was already divided; his power of speech, carefully trained and developed, could easily gain him power in a city with some 7000 burghers, and by his expositions on market-days he was able also to gain influence over the country people.

Zwingli found also in the press a helpful ally; the printer Froschauer was one of his closest adherents; his writings, which bear the mark of extempore utterance rather than of careful preparation, were often intended

for the press, and spread through its channels of trade; letters could be sent and received through the same means, for the printer's house was a centre of news and communication: Froschauer, for instance, had a branch establishment at Frankfort and could circulate Zwingli's writings easily and carry his letters for him. The effect of Zwingli's works—hastily written for the most part, rarely classic in form or of permanent value for thought—was often immediate and great; he was a religious pamphleteer of learning, vigour, and experience.

In his private life there are few dates of importance. He was attacked by the plague (September, 1519), to meet which he had courageously returned from a holiday; but there are no reasons for regarding this illness as a religious crisis in his life. His marriage with Anne Reinhard, widow of Hans Meyer of Knonau, son of a distinguished family, took place (April 2, 1524) after a dubious connexion of some two years, and was hailed by some of his friends as a tardy though welcome act of courage. By the end of 1525 his Reformation at Zurich was in effect completed; and from that time onward his activity was either political or directed against Anabaptist enemies.

In February, 1519, the Franciscan Bernardin Samson, who had previously encountered Zwingli at Einsiedeln, reached Zurich to preach his Indulgence. Zwingli opposed him at once and with success; the Bishop of Constance forbade the clergy of the diocese to admit Samson into their churches; the Council of Zurich forbade his entry into the city. But Zwingli and Luther met with very different treatment: Samson was ordered by the Pope himself not to vex the authorities of Zurich, and rather than do so to depart; no breach between the Papacy and Zwingli resulted; a monk who wished to print abuse of him was checked by both Legate and Bishop. The first sign of anti-papal feeling upon his part comes after the Imperial election (January–June, 1519). The papal policy in that matter was too shifty to commend itself to Zwingli's honest and outspoken nature, and moreover he wished the Swiss to stand aloof.

But the Lutheran drama had by this time come to a crisis, and following the advice of friends, Beatus Rhenanus among them, Zwingli had interested himself in Luther's fate; after the Leipzig disputation he hailed him as "David" and "Hercules," and exerted himself to delay the publication of the Papal Bull against him. At this time too he read Hus' work *On the Church*, which is practically a new edition of Wiclif's *De Ecclesia*, and contains many of the doctrines—such as those touching the papal power, and the civil right to control the Church—afterwards taught by Zwingli.

The question how far Zwingli was indebted to Luther has been much discussed. Like Luther, he had been called a heretic after his opposition to Samson. To him as to others the name Lutheran was carelessly given. His private Biblical annotations show new doctrinal tendencies after 1522, when he had undoubtedly read Luther's works. But the

assumption that he owed his views to Luther always roused his indignation, and a common Pauline element fully explains the likeness of their opinions, slight as it is. Zwingli tried to clear himself from the charge of imitation, and claimed for himself originality. In doing so he was justified, though his treatment of the charge shows some petulance and self-satisfaction. But it is too much to say that the bold stand made by Luther and the whole set of problems he raised had no effect upon Zwingli's mind and did nothing to direct his activity into new channels. Their original impulses, however, were very different, and their several treatment of Indulgences illustrates the difference. To Luther the question presented itself as a mistaken doctrine which struck at the root of religion; to Zwingli it was more a practical abuse, an encroachment of the Church upon the individual life.

The divergence of Zwingli from Erasmus and its occasion are also instructive. Hutten, in his energy and contempt for tradition, his licence and disregard of morality, had little in common with Erasmus on the one hand or with Luther on the other, although his love of learning and width of outlook joined him to both. Before his death, however, in August, 1523, a quarrel with Erasmus brought out the fundamental opposition between them. Zwingli, linked to Erasmus by early indebtedness and a scholar's reverence, had yet more in common with Hutten; and when the dying outcast, disowned by the calmer souls, reached Zurich, Zwingli befriended him; he did this, not from mere human sympathy, but also from the feeling of a common cause against the old society and the old traditions. But his action caused a breach between him and Erasmus, and with Glareanus also, "the shadow of Erasmus." This marks a certain separation of Zwingli from the aims of the humanist circles in which he had hitherto lived; for Basel and Einsiedeln, unlike Luzern, were both centres of learning.

In his sermons Zwingli, who was both outspoken and effective, attacked monasticism and the doctrines of Purgatory and the Invocation of Saints. But the first conflict took place when he attacked the principle of tithes. In a Latin sermon preached before the Chapter, he maintained that tithes had no foundation in the Divine Law, and should be voluntary. The Provost urged him in vain to recant, and not to furnish arms for the laity to use against the clergy (early in 1520). The same year a simplification of the breviary for the Minster was prepared and introduced (June 27, 1520)—a change arising out of Zwingli's earlier liturgical studies, and showing that the majority of the Chapter was on his side.

Religious parties were already forming themselves around him. He met with opposition both from the conservatives in the Chapter (including Conrad Hoffman, who had supported his election) and from the monks. The excitement raised was shown by a decree of 1520, ordering priests in town and country to preach conformably to the Gospels and Epistles and according to the guidance of the Holy Spirit and the

Bible, but to keep silence upon human innovations. This decree, proceeding not from the Bishop but from the civil rulers, and taking the Bible as a standard, exhibited two characteristics of the Zwinglian position.

The political events of these years were decisive for Zwingli and for Zurich. The French, at a Diet held at Luzern (May 5, 1521), strove to get support from the Confederates. Pensions had already done much harm to social and political life; the mercenary soldiers, whether abroad selling their lives for gold, or at home spending it in riot, were an injury to the State. The ostentatious display of wealth made by the French envoys, both in the Imperial election and now in their search for an alliance, emphasised the dangers of mercenary service. Zwingli, together with the Burgomaster Marcus Röust, opposed the French alliance; the Diet, however, made a treaty with Francis I by which he might enlist troops up to 16,000 under leaders of his own choice. The Bernese statesman Albrecht von Stein came to Zurich to secure its approval; for the city with its villages could raise an army of 10,000. But, stimulated by sermons of passionate patriotism from Zwingli, reminding them again and again of their hard-bought freedom and traditional simplicity, the Zurich Council rejected the French alliance. The Council of the Two Hundred answered to the Diet, that they would keep to their old leagues, and would have nothing to do with Princes, pensions, and foreign alliances; and the Pension decree which forbade the receipt of any alien gifts was to be sworn to by all the citizens twice a year. But the loss of wealth, the separation from the other Cantons, and the comparative stagnation of neutral life soon caused discontent in the Corinth of Switzerland; and Zwingli had to bear many reproaches. About this time he resigned his papal pension from conscientious scruples, but soon after received a canonry in the Minster with a prebend of 70 *gulden*; this benefice gave him the franchise, and from this time his political importance grew. He was now the centre of a growing group; Berthold Haller at Bern, Vadian (von Watt), the gifted Burgomaster of St Gallen, and others; the humanistic brotherhood was passing into a Reforming society, and was soon to be used as a diplomatic power.

Zwingli's defection from the Papacy was now only a matter of time. An incident often assigned as its cause was even more important for Zurich than for him. The Pope asked for a force to be used only for the defence of his States, not against the French or other Swiss. Zurich, which sent him half his body-guard, was the place where he sought it. Zwingli, who had once before supported a papal application, now opposed it. But a force of 6000 set out (September 16, 1521) and was in the end sent to Milan. The Council indignantly recalled it; but some of the soldiers followed Cardinal Schinner, and narrowly escaped a conflict with the Swiss mercenaries of France. To make things worse, their pay was withheld even after their return. The Council, supported by popular feeling, now forbade all foreign service (January 11, 1522).

This same year, the question of Lenten observance began the Zwinglian Reformation. Some of Zwingli's followers did not share his willingness to wait for the action of the magistracy. The printer Froschauer and others ate meat publicly, in the presence of Leo Jud and Zwingli himself. They could justify themselves by his teaching that nothing not commanded by Scripture was binding upon Christians, and he undertook their defence. His sermon *On the Choice or Freedom of Food* was preached now (March 30, 1522) and afterwards printed, as were many of his sermons delivered about this time. He advocated freedom for the individual, upon whom lay the responsibility to act without scandal.

The civic authorities made a compromise: no distinction was drawn, they said, by the New Testament between kinds of food; but for the sake of peace the old rule should be kept until changed by authority, and the people's priests were to check the people from any breach of this ruling. The disregard of custom and authority shown by the decree and the act leading to it could not be overlooked; and the Bishop of Constance sent a commission, consisting of his Suffragan (Melchior Wattli) and two others, to settle the matter. The commissioners laid their views before the priests and the Smaller Council, and commanded them to observe existing customs (April 7, 1522). Before the Great Council Zwingli answered the Suffragan's arguments, and the debate really turned upon Church authority and custom as against individual freedom. At its close the Council repeated its old decree, pending a settlement by the Bishop of Constance, which they begged him to make according to the law of Christ. This was a practical abrogation of episcopal power, for the Bishop's standing was clear. The Zwinglian Reformation, therefore, begins as an ecclesiastical revolution, founded on action rather than doctrine, by which a city freed itself from outward control and organised itself afresh.

His learned friend Johann Faber, the Vicar-General of Constance, afterwards an Aulic Councillor and Bishop of Vienna, had just returned from a visit to Rome (May, 1522) and thenceforth led the opposition against Zwingli. So early as 1519 the latter had marked him as one from whom, although a humanist, the Gospel had little to hope. Zwingli's literary work at this time recalls that of Wiclif in the years before his death; his *Archeteles*—a full statement of his position—was written in haste and appeared now (August 22, 1522). On reading it Erasmus begged him to be more cautious and to act with others; Œcolampadius also urged restraint. The same year (July 2) ten priests joined Zwingli in a petition to the Bishop to allow clerical marriage, wherein the wish for innovation was as distinct as the picture of existing morals was dark. There can be no doubt that the priests in Switzerland, owing partly to the disorganisation of episcopal rule and partly to the isolation of their parishes, had a low standard of life; of this there is

ample evidence from both episcopal and Reforming documents. A like request made to the Federal Diet (July 13) was accompanied by a repudiation of the names Lutheran and Hussites. These requests had no result beyond making clear the position of those who preferred them.

At Zurich repeated troubles with the monks, and disturbances during Zwingli's sermons, made it necessary for the Burgomaster to restore order. His decree—this time coupled with no appeal to the Bishop—was that the pure Word of God must be preached, and the Scholastics (a term loosely used for teachers held to be old-fashioned) left alone. A Chapter (August 15) of the country clergymen came to the same decision. Thus backed by civic and clerical authority, Zwingli held himself free The Bible—as interpreted by the responsible "Bishop" (so he terms all pastors and indeed in one place all humanists)—was to be the sole guide of faith. City and country, pastors and magistrates were combined into a stronghold of Reform. The system thus begun may be described on the one side as individualistic and on the other as civic. The appeal to the Scriptures alone was individualistic, due to humanism without prepossession; the civic element was due to the circumstances of Zurich.

In a federal republic accustomed to Diets a Public Disputation—suggested in *Archeteles*—seemed a likely way to settle controversies. It recalled at once University exercises and General Councils; it was at once learned and democratic. Such an assembly was called at the end of the year, and met in Zurich (January 29, 1523). The invitation to this Disputation shows the Great Council for the first time definitely on Zwingli's side; and each subsequent stage of the Swiss Reformation was marked by a similar encounter. Zwingli had resigned his parochial charge, but had been allowed by the Council the use of the pulpit. In the Disputation he and his doctrine were the central points of debate. To regulate the Disputation he had drawn up 67 theses.

The fundamental conception of the doctrine here set forth was that of the Church as a democratic body of all Christians, each in open communication with God independently of externals or means of grace, guided by the study of Scripture and the illumination of God's Spirit. To this conception the republicanism of letters and of Switzerland had each contributed something. Starting from this assumption, the Theses place the Gospel alone as the basis of truth and the secular authority as the governor of the organisation; they deny the power of Pope and hierarchy, the sacrifice in the Mass, the Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, times of fasting, and clerical celibacy.

About 600 were present at the Disputation, including representatives of the Bishop with Faber among them; Schaffhausen, however, was the only Canton which sent deputies. Faber urged the postponement of a decision until the expected General Council met; but Zwingli's reply was that the Word of God was the sole authority, and competent scholars

could interpret it, so that there was no need of a Council's decision. When the audience met after dinner, the Burgomaster Röust, who presided, declared in the name of the Council that Zwingli had not been convicted of heresy, and therefore ordered that he should go on preaching the Holy Gospel with the Holy Spirit's help. Zurich was thus committed to Zwingli, and the importance of the decision was shown by Faber's printing his own account of what took place as a correction of the Zurich account. The First Disputation marks Zwingli's control of the city as established, and their joint complete and open rupture with the past

Zwingli was now sure of his ground and could proceed more rapidly: his literary activity was accompanied by practical changes. Leo Jud had translated the Baptismal Office into German and used it (August 10, 1523). A committee was appointed to deal with the Minster Chapter, for which a new constitution was issued (September 29, 1523). Fees for Baptism and Burial were abolished; holders of Minster offices were to discharge their duties to the utmost of their health and strength; as they died off, their places were to be left unfilled (unless chaplains were needed), and the income was to be applied to other purposes. The Chapter's fall was not undeserved; for, though there were some excellent members, it had become a refuge for men of good family and poor education. The Bible was to be read by the Minster clergy publicly an hour a day in Hebrew, Greek and Latin, with explanations; free lectures and fit lodgings were provided for candidates for the ministry, so that they need no longer go abroad. The public lectures were the origin of the later "prophesying." In this scheme of teaching Zwingli had able helpers in Leo Jud, people's priest at All Saints (1523), and Myconius, now (1524) at the Minster school. Zwingli remained faithful to the principles of Erasmus, and never fell into the easy error of underestimating education as compared with spiritual zeal. The educational scheme was completed for Zurich itself, after the dissolution of the monasteries which followed in December, 1524. What remained of the Chapter's income when education had been provided for, went to the poor and the aged; in his poor-laws, as in all his social legislation, Zwingli showed a clear and almost modern appreciation of needs and methods, notably in his discouragement of mendicancy and use of careful enquiry.

The literary side of Zwingli's work in this stage was the *Auslegung und Begrundung der Schlussreden*, an unsystematic explanation of the Theses for the Disputation. The work, which was preceded by a letter to the Council and people of Glarus, was a full and in parts lengthy exposition of the Theses; written in German, it was "a farrago of all the opinions which are controverted to-day." The explanations of the Theses upon the Papacy and the Mass are especially long, which is noteworthy, as Zwingli had as yet not attacked the Mass in practice.

This work, written night and day amid the expectation of his friends, and incidentally discussing his relations with Luther, may be held to contain the full programme of the Helvetic Reformation (July 14, 1523).

Not only did he dislike to be called Lutheran, but on some points, such as Purgatory, Confession, and Invocation of Saints, he differs from Luther. Against the monks he inveighs strongly: all monasteries ought to be turned into hospitals. The Reformation in Switzerland made most way where there were many monasteries, and least where there were none; the differences that arose between the larger Houses and their tenants made the latter more eager to embrace Protestantism. And the secularisation of the monasteries—here laid down as desirable—was a very practical part of the Swiss Reformation: the peasants in some parts undoubtedly looked for profit from the dissolution. Zwingli also explains his method of dealing with doctrine; the Invocation of Saints he had let remain until the populace should have learnt to do without it and worship Christ alone. Confirmation and Extreme Unction he would retain as rites, not as Sacraments; but Auricular Confession, pictures, and music, should be banished from churches.

Zwingli held that it was his part to teach, but that to make changes belonged to the civic authority. But his teaching had led some of his followers to act without waiting for the civic rulers; pictures and images were torn down both in town and country. After much discussion the question came before the Great Council, which suspended judgment until a second Disputation should be held. This took place on October 26, 1523. The Bishops and the other Cantons were invited, but the Bishops did not come; 800 persons, 350 of them ecclesiastics, were present; this time St Gallen as well as Schaffhausen was represented; Luzern and Obwalden angrily refused the invitation. The first day's debate was upon images and pictures, which Zwingli held forbidden in all cases; some urged delay, but the final decision was that idols and pictures should be removed, but without a breach of the peace; those who had already broken the peace were to be pardoned as a rule, but a leader, Nicholas Hottinger, was afterwards banished for two years. On the second day the Mass was discussed; Zwingli had prepared Theses according to which the Mass was no sacrifice and had been surrounded by abuses. But the appearance in this Disputation of the Anabaptists, an organised radical party basing their views upon his teaching, and yet going beyond him in action, hampered him greatly and made the magistracy cautious.

At the Disputation Zwingli noted in a formal way that the ecclesiastical authorities had done nothing; this was true, although the Bishop of Constance had in a dignified note asserted his constitutional position; he could not appear, and he begged them to exercise restraint. But the civil authorities were now, in Zwingli's view and in their own, called upon to act. A commission of eight members of the two

Councils and six ecclesiastics was named to discuss what steps should be taken. Until a settlement the clergy were to be instructed by an epistle, which Zwingli was asked to write; preachers were also sent out; Wolfgang Joner, Abbot of Kappel, who had lately called the younger Bullinger to his help, together with others, visited the Canton; Zwingli himself went in the direction of the Thurgau. The Second Disputation, wherein discussion turned solely on the interpretation of the Scriptures, marks a fresh stage in the Reformation, even apart from the appearance of the Anabaptists. The *Short Introduction to Christian Doctrine* (*Eine kurze christliche Inleitung*) is its literary monument.

The Reformation was now no longer a purely civic affair. From the first the Catholic Cantons had been indisposed to treat it as such; among people of simple minds and with an unformed Federal system religious innovation and religious discord put a heavy strain both upon Federal action and other bonds of union. The Federal Diet at Baden (September 30, 1523) had threatened all innovators with punishment, and Luzern in particular had shown by its action the strength of its feelings. The Reformation had thus already divided the Confederation, and no Diet had been held at Zurich since March, 1522; the union of the Cantons before this time had, however, been so loose that it is easy to overestimate the retrograde effects of the Reformation.

The *Introduction*, written in fourteen days, was circulated in November, 1523, and was intended for the clergy, not the public. It started from an explanation of the relations between the Law and the Gospel, passing on to an application to present needs, the question of images, and that of the Mass. Throughout the Canton priests here and there ceased to say mass; when Conrad Hoffman and the Catholics of the Chapter complained, the Council, advised by the parish priests, forbade them to speak or act against what had been settled, under pain of loss of their benefices and banishment; at Whitsuntide a full settlement should be made (January, 1524). A further appeal from the Catholic Cantons to abstain from innovations (February 25, 1524) only called forth the answer that they would observe the Federal League, but could not yield in matters of conscience (March 21). For Christmas Day, 1523, Zwingli had announced an administration in both kinds at the Cathedral, and the substitution of a sermon for the daily mass. The Council, however, decreed that until Whitsuntide old Mass and new Administration should continue side by side. Images and crucifixes—the use of which had been quietly checked for some time—were on no account to be carried about. The exact form of the substitute for the Mass was to be settled at a fresh Disputation (December 19, 1523).

When Whitsuntide came (May 15, 1524) the Council resolved to act on its own authority without waiting for the Bishop. The committee appointed in 1523 suggested the removal of pictures and images by legally named authorities at the wish of each community, and Zwingli

urged the replacing of the early Mass by a sermon and the Lord's Supper. The committee, however, did not altogether follow him as to the Mass; this was left in use, but the images were removed. The tardy intervention of the Bishop, defending the Mass and images, was disregarded. This decision was adopted by both Councils and sent round to the bailiffs in the country for execution (June–July). The majority of a village, however, could decide to keep or remove images as they pleased. Removal was to be carried out by the pastor and responsible men; the use of organs, the passing bell, and extreme unction were also abolished. A reply to the Bishop was composed by Zwingli, who was now all-powerful, and approved by the Council. The section on the Mass is Zwingli's first complete statement of his views, which he was now developing. He carried on a controversy, partly as to this subject, with Jerome Emser of Leipzig, who had attacked Luther for his alteration of the Canon; in his *Antibolon* (August 18) in answer to this opponent, in an *Apology* addressed to Diebold Geroldseck (October 9, 1523), in his *De Canone Missae Epichiresis* (1523), in his *Subsidium sive Coronis de Eucharistia* (1525), and in his *De Vera et Falsa Religione* (1525) Zwingli dealt with this central point. Negatively, he repudiated all sacramental efficacy, and reduced the rite to a mere sign (*nuda signa*): positively, he laid great stress—notably in his reply to Emser—upon its aspect as a feast and a corporate act; it was therefore social, not merely individual in its importance.

The Mass at Zurich was abolished in April, 1525, but the religious Houses had been previously suppressed; the monks who did not return to the world were placed together in the Franciscan monastery; the convent of the Minster of our Lady (December 4, 1524) and the Chapter of the Great Minster (December 20) gave up their possessions to the city; the monasteries throughout the Canton followed. The incomes were devoted to education or the poor; a *gymnasium*, for instance, was endowed with the funds of the Great Minster, and Zwingli himself became rector of the Carolinum (April 14, 1525) as the united scholastic foundations were called. His scheme of graduated studies leading up to the ministry was adequate and well thought out. By a development of the plan of Biblical instruction begun in 1523 the prophesyings or expositions took the place of the choir services, while the linguistic instruction was extended (July 19, 1525). When a Synodal organisation (September 23, 1527) and Church Courts (*Still-stände*) for discipline and marriage-cases were set up (May 10, 1525), the Reformation upon its constructive as well as its destructive side was completed. As a purely civic organisation even in its details it was systematic and orderly: a register of baptisms, for instance, was begun in 1526 for the city and afterwards extended to the Canton. Of the elaborate system thus established Zwingli was the "Bishop" and the soul.

It seems strange to find the Council at this date (August 19, 1524)

writing to the Pope that they were unable to stop the course of change, even had they wished, owing to the strength of popular opinion. The Pope's reply was conciliatory, and prolonged negotiations took place (1525–6); the city trying to obtain the arrears of its military pay, and Clement VII seeking to keep the city firm in its old alliance. In no respect were the positions of Luther and of Zwingli more contrasted than in the treatment they received from the Papacy, and the cause of this was the papal hope of help from Zurich.

The civic position of Zwingli was now significant. Theoretically he might consider the congregation the ecclesiastical power, but in practice the community acted. He had realised his conception of the prophet guiding the community; nay more, he was, as Salat says, "Burgomaster, secretary, and Council in one." First the Great Council, the democratic body, had been won, then the Smaller Council, and finally events gave Zwingli even further power. Marcus Roust and Felix Schmid, the experienced Burgomasters, had died (1524), Joachim am Grüt, Zwingli's opponent in the debates upon the Mass (1525), had been dismissed from his office of city clerk (end of 1525). Zwingli was the sole leader left. At a threatening crisis (November 20, 1524) the Burgomaster and the chief Gild-master received authority to settle pressing business privately with the help of trusty men. This is the first appearance of the Privy Council in and through which Zwingli afterwards worked, and to which foreign affairs were mainly entrusted. The experience of the Peasants' War (1524–5) inclined Zwingli to a body less democratic than a large assembly, and his policy often required secresy. Through this body, the *Heimliche Rath*, or the Privy Six, which became permanent in 1529, Zwingli exerted his influence. The Council itself was "purged" by the exclusion of those opposed to him (December 9, 1528), who were found chiefly among the nobles. The numbers representing the *Constafel* in the two Councils were reduced, from 6 to 3, and from 18 to 12, respectively (1529). Thus beyond the Protestant democracy and the two Councils stood the commanding personality of Zwingli, working through and upon each of them, but above them all, through the Privy Six

Zwingli had been so gently treated by the Pope, and his career had been so fortunate, that his conflict with the Anabaptists might well seem to him the hardest struggle undergone by him. The leaders of that party had been among those who, by eating flesh in Lent, began the breach with episcopacy. They and their followers pulled down crucifixes before the State had legalised such acts; but they could appeal to Zwingli's teaching. They first appear as a distinct party in the Second Disputation (October, 1523). Conrad Grebel—son of Jacob Grebel, executed November, 1526, for treason—and Felix Manz, both men of influential families and with private grudges against Zwingli, were leaders of this radical party in the city; outside the city were other local centres—Zolliken, Wyteken, and Hongg. The dislike of tithes—

so loudly expressed in the Peasants' Revolt—was shared by many Anabaptists; and at Grüningen, a centre where this economic side of the Anabaptist movement showed itself, it united with that of the peasants. Zwingli himself was averse from levying the small tithes upon vegetables and fruit; he held further that tithes had merely legal, but no Scriptural, warrant. The Council, however, disagreed with him, and tithes were maintained.

At first the movement was indigenous; but late in 1524 Münzer came to Waldshut (N.W. of Zurich), and Carlstadt to Zurich itself; some German Anabaptists from St Gallen also worked in Zurich territory; these influences from outside intensified the movement and organised it. But it was more a radical than a doctrinal movement; and hence Zwingli, jealous for the unity of his new organisation and yet largely in sympathy with their views, appealed to the Anabaptists in vain not to found a separate body. When they did so, a public Disputation with them, the first of several, was arranged (January 17-18, 1525), and it was followed by a decree that all unbaptised children must be baptised within a week, or their parents would be banished. Some of the leaders were imprisoned; and with these Zwingli held private and repeated discussions.

Inasmuch as this new society rejected the authority of magistrates and pastors alike, the Council by severe punishment tried to suppress the movement. Manz was put to death by drowning (January 7, 1527), and the foreign leaders were banished, most of them to meet violent deaths later and elsewhere. In spite of Zwingli's severity against them, due to his resentment as a rejected leader, whom they had come to hate as "the false prophet," their small congregations continued to exist. Their energy afterwards found vent in needed criticism of clerical life; and the Synod of Easter, 1528, had for one of its objects a tightening of clerical discipline which might meet the objections and gain over the objectors.

After the final removal of the Mass the radicals turned to social matters, and, especially at Grüningen, attacked the tithes. An agitation against tithes and the monasteries had to a great extent common objects with the Zwinglians, the houses of Rüti and Bubikon were attacked by rioters; and a popular assembly at Töss (June 5, 1525) caused great fear The defeat of the Peasants' Revolt in Germany made the allied movement easier to deal with in Switzerland, and Zwingli's negotiations, together with public disputations, resulted in a settlement. Tithes remained, but personal servitude, where the ownership of the State was concerned, was done away with. The villagers of the lake communes were henceforth regarded as citizens of the town. The general result here as in Germany was to arouse a dread of change; and outside Zurich Zwingli's teaching was greatly blamed as an exciting cause. Incidentally, the vain attempt of Ulrich of Württemberg to regain his duchy by the

help of the peasants and Swiss mercenaries had made the governments at Ensisheim and Innsbruck suspicious of Switzerland. The grievances of the peasants, intensified by the effect of the Reformation upon the public lands, remained unredressed, and, a century later, led to the Peasants' War (1653). Few chapters in the history of federalism are more instructive than this failure on the part of a democratic federation to govern its conquests or to respect their liberties.

The Reformation had brought a new cause of division into the Confederacy. Religious disunion—save in the occasional form of heresy—was an unlooked-for thing, and the Federal authority scarcely knew how to treat it. The Forest Cantons were keen enemies of change; they regarded the Zurich innovations as threatening to themselves. On the other hand Zurich naturally regarded herself as free to make what changes she wished. This difficulty would have strained Federal relations, especially where much of Church government had been already taken over by the civil power; but it might have been overcome. When Zurich—disregarding the principle of government by the majority of the Cantons—pushed religious change into the Subject Lands the difficulty was increased. The frequent division of the higher and lower jurisdiction between the Confederates and a single Canton gave rise to the further question: under which jurisdiction came religious offences? The majority of the Cantons governing the Subject Lands were Catholic; Zurich in many places held the lower jurisdiction. As early as November, 1522, the Federal Diet ordered the bailiffs in the Subject Lands to bring before them the priests who spoke against the faith, thus claiming religious offences for the higher jurisdiction. But these beginnings of discord in the Federation were bound up with the beginnings of a local reformation upon Catholic lines.

The Bishop of Constance, like his brother-Bishop Christopher von Uttenheim of Basel, had tried to improve his diocese, as his pastoral letter of 1517 shows. With these efforts there was widespread sympathy, and when the three Bishops of Basel, Lausanne, and Constance complained to the Diet at Luzern (January 26, 1524) of the disturbed state of things in their dioceses, the Diet not only (as already noted) sent an embassy to Zurich urging caution, but proposed to undertake a reformation on the lines of unity, admitting that abuses ought to be redressed. Exactions, traffic in benefices, Indulgences were condemned; the Diet would consult with Zurich as to the best means of shaking off the yoke which the injustice of Popes, Cardinals, and prelates had laid upon the Swiss people. But this reformation was to be undertaken by the State, and the Federal Diet was to be the ruling authority. Nothing could better prove the ecclesiastical anarchy into which Switzerland had fallen, and the chance that a reforming Papacy would have had of preserving unity and yet securing progress. Luzern, whence these proposals came, was afterwards a centre of the Counter-Reformation.

They were rejected by Zurich, but resulted in the Disputation at Baden (May–June, 1526). Zwingli, however, it was easy to see, cared little for unity or peace, compared with the carrying out of his own far-reaching plans.

At Beckenried, April 8, 1524, the Five Cantons, Luzern, Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, and Zug, formed a separate league to suppress all Hussite, Lutheran, or Zwinglian errors. A further remonstrance was made to Zurich by all the Cantons except Schaffhausen and Appenzell, and the intention of not sitting in Diet along with Zurich was declared (July 16, 1524). The Mass, pictures, images, and fasting were pronounced binding upon all Swiss. Zurich on the other hand declared religion to be a purely cantonal matter. This was a question hard to settle, with no precedents to refer to. Zurich, however, put itself in the wrong by its action in the Thurgau, where it held the lower jurisdiction, exercised through its bailiffs. Preachers, for the most part connected with Zwingli, had worked their way here—such as Oechsli (an old Einsiedeln friend of his) at Burg. When Oechsli was seized by the Federal officer who exercised the higher jurisdiction, his friends and parishioners gathered to rescue him (July 17, 1524): afterwards in a riotous mob they proceeded to the Carthusian monastery of Ittingen, and set it on fire. At Stammheim and Stein images were destroyed. The seizure of the leaders—three of whom were executed at Baden—embittered Zurich; but the other Cantons in their turn blamed its encouragement of the preachers.

Six Cantons (Luzern, Uri, Unterwalden, Schwyz, Zug, and Freiburg) now threatened to break the league; but Bern was inclined to support the independence of the Cantons, upon the principle *cujus regio, ejus religio*. At a Diet at Zug it was proposed to raise the country districts against Zurich on account of her destruction of images, but to this step Bern and Solothurn objected. Zurich had, however, made sure of the loyalty of her subjects in the religious changes, just as she referred to them the French alliance and the demands of the peasants. But the Cantons were now divided into hostile factions; and outside lay Austria embittered by the help sent from Zurich to a rising at Waldshut and Swiss support of Duke Ulrich.

At the end of 1524 Zwingli, always fertile in suggestions and skilful in expression, came forward with a remarkable plan. Zurich was to strengthen herself in military equipment—her reputation for military strength was great; she was to seek alliances with France and Savoy; to promise St Gallen and the Thurgau the property of the monasteries in their territory as a price for their support; and to raise Tyrol against Austria. It is clear that Zwingli's range was extending: it was now that he entered into relations with Duke Ulrich; he now also took the religious movement in his old home, Toggenburg, under his care, and the Reformation was soon fully under way (1524–5).

The disaster of Pavia (February 24, 1525) wrought some change in Federal feeling; the loss of 5000 Swiss, followed by the retreat of the remainder, made the French alliance less popular; people freely cursed the French, pensions, and subsidies. Thus, Zwingli's old policy of doing away with mercenary service was recommended; but he had now departed from his former dislike of alliances. An alliance with France was soon one of his dearest hopes; his work at Zurich was safe; to make Protestantism in the Common Lands equally safe, and afterwards to gain freedom for his preachers in the Catholic Cantons, were now the objects of his policy. To carry such a policy into effect foreign alliances were needed. But nearer than France lay southern Germany, the cities of which were in many ways more like Zurich than was Bern, and here his doctrines made rapid way. These cities were naturally inclined to an organisation of religion that was at once civic and democratic; Strassburg—with its many subject villages—was a mediator by position and interest; the new diplomatists were the preachers, with something of Zwingli's influence in their respective cities, and many of them in constant correspondence with him. The decentralising of influences which had once centred in Rome or in the greater ecclesiastical Courts; the substitution of pastors and dogmatic leaders for Cardinals and Legates—these are leading features of Reformation politics. Thus the main interest of Zwingli's letters in the following years is political and diplomatic. His object was to give Zurich a great dominion such as she had sought and lost in the old Zurich war, to make her the *Vorort*, no longer of eastern Switzerland only, but of a new Confederacy reaching into the Empire and holding at bay the Emperor (of whom he wished to see the world well rid). But this dominion was to be based upon a common religion.

As the forces of religious change drew together, so did the forces of conservatism. Archduke Ferdinand had gathered the leading Catholic States (June, 1524) at Ratisbon; to them, as to the Diet at Luzern, the suppression of heresy seemed the most urgent duty; the minor ecclesiastical reforms secured from the Legate Campeggio fell far short of the Swiss plan of reform. Faber had been at this conference; in this year (1526) he became an imperial Councillor, and now he began to organise the Catholic party in Switzerland. For this purpose a Disputation was suggested at Baden (January 15, 1526); John Mayer of Eck—a many-sided and able man—was eager to meet Zwingli. But the latter at first declined to meet him anywhere save at Zurich; and afterwards, when Zwingli was ready to go to St Gallen or Schaffhausen, the Zurich Council refused him leave for the journey. When the meeting took place at Baden (May 21—June 18, 1526), he was therefore not present, and Œcolampadius from Basel had to take his place. But the most elaborate arrangements were made for sending him daily reports and receiving his advice. Eck, with his Theses, played the part that Zwingli had played at Zurich, and in the opinion of the majority (82 to

20) played it well. The reputation of the victory greatly strengthened the Catholic party.

But Zurich was now no longer the sole centre of Reform. At Schaffhausen, Hofmeister, at Biel, Wyttenbach, Zwingli's old teacher at Basel, were preaching freely. In Basel Capito's work (1512–20) was more than carried on by Œcolampadius, now (February, 1525) minister at St Martin's. Bern, the most important of all the cities, was, in religion as in politics, inclined to a policy of its own. Political power was here in the hands of the aristocracy, the gilds being politically unimportant; Berthold Haller and Sebastian Meier by their preaching shared the work of the painter-dramatist Nicholas Manuel, to whom some ascribe the direction of Bernese policy, until his death in 1530. Free preaching, if in accord with God's Word, was allowed, but innovations were forbidden; pictures, fasting, and other points disputed elsewhere were left untouched; but heretical books were prohibited (June 15, 1523; November 22, 1524). The magistracy, however, claimed the right to punish priests disregarding these decrees; the monasteries were placed under civic control, and clerical incomes were regulated. But the power of the preachers grew; and at Easter, 1527, both the Great and the Small Council had Protestant majorities. A decree maintaining the old worship for the present with a speedy prospect of change was passed; but some priests here as elsewhere anticipated the change. Political interests moved Bern in the same direction. Although disturbed by the Peasants' War, Bern was still unwilling to put pressure upon Zurich; and towards the end of 1526, through fear of Austria, drew nearer to her. Bern, Zurich, Basel, Glarus, and Appenzell did not share the desire of the Catholic Cantons to base their Federal union upon a common belief, but wished to found it only upon common interests.

The Bernese authorities decided, like Zurich, to hold a Disputation to which the Bishops and delegates from the Cantons were invited. Zwingli came with the Burgomaster, Diethelm Röust. Here (January 6, 1528) ten Theses, drawn up by Zwingli, Haller, and Roll, were debated. They treated of the Mass as a sacrifice, of pictures, and of Purgatory; the validity of Church ordinances, except when grounded upon God's Word, was denied. Thesis IV, "that the body and blood of Christ are substantially and corporally received in the Eucharist cannot be proved from the Scripture," caused much discussion. The Disputations ended as Zwingli wished. The Mass was replaced by sermons; images were soon removed, and even the Minster organ was broken up (February 17, 1528). In some respects, however, Bern did not follow Zurich; when the latter supported by force the Reformation in the Thurgau, Bern parted company, and her constant fear of Savoy led her to look more to the west and less to the east than did Zurich.

The Bernese Reformation was less doctrinal than the Zurich, but the secularisation of the monasteries was a great feature in its case also

(1527); the funds so derived were devoted partly to the State, partly to replacing foreign pensions, which were now definitely renounced (February, 1528). The Bernese Oberlanders, however, had hoped to share the property of the monastery at Interlaken, and, when this was seized for the government, the inhabitants of the Haslithal rose in rebellion; some citizens of Unterwalden, believing the statement of these peasants that the Reformation was forced upon them, crossed the Brünig to their help, and it cost Bern much trouble to put down the movement so supported. This incident, for which Bern claimed compensation, was a cause of much ill-will.

About a year later (February, 1529) the Reformation was carried through at Basel, but not without tumults which drove Erasmus away to Louvain, the centre of the Counter-Reformation. Muhlhausen, Schaffhausen (where the movement was democratic), St Gallen, and the Free Bailiwicks (especially Bremgarten) followed in the same direction; while Appenzell (the outer Rhodes allowing freedom of belief, 1524) and Glarus were divided; the Graubunden—where opposition to the Bishop had long existed—allowed liberty of preaching in 1526.

But Zwingli's outlook included Germany as well as Switzerland; his doctrines, opposed to those of Luther, were here working their way inwards; and therefore the relations between Emperor and Princes greatly affected him. Constance, always hostile to the Emperor, and Lindau, controlled the Lake of Constance. In the former, Protestant views, taught by the Swabian Reformer, Ambrose Blarer, a friend of Melanchthon, and Zurik, had such hold that the Bishop (1526) moved to Meersburg, and the Chapter to Ueberlingen. The Federal Diet (November 4, 1527) refused to admit Constance as a member; but on Christmas-day the Council of Zurich decided to conclude with Constance a religious and political League, called *das christliche Burgerrecht.* The treaty was modelled upon that which had admitted Basel to the Confederates (June 9, 1501); it contained provisions for mutual help, mainly defensive; it allowed of extension, and indeed the conquest of lands for Constance is spoken of, a seeming reference to the Thurgau. But the peculiarity of the new Treaty lay in its being based upon theological unity—a principle which was to have a long and disastrous future in diplomacy. To Strassburg—where the preachers Capito, Bucer, and Hedio were already his friends—Zwingli sent (August, 1527) an envoy to discuss its admission to the new League; the admission of Bern, discussed at the Bern Disputation, was merely a question of time; it followed Constance (June 25, 1528). The Reformation in the Common Lands was now a pressing question, and a clause in the Treaty provided that preachers there should be protected, and no subject punished for his belief; if the majority anywhere decided for Reform, they were to be left free to carry it out. The first place to which this applied was the Toggenburg, Zwingli's old home.

Other cities quickly followed: St Gallen (November 3); Biel (January 28, 1529); Mühlhausen (February 17); Basel (March 3); and after a longer interval Schaffhausen (October 15), which had a somewhat varied religious history. Strassburg, after many proposals and discussions (due to Bern's unwillingness to pass beyond Switzerland), finally entered the League (January 5, 1530), when the danger from Austria seemed great, and Zwingli's activity, stimulated by Philip of Hesse, was almost feverish. The edifice was to be crowned by the admission of Hesse; but only Zurich, Basel, and Strassburg would consent to so risky an alliance; and in the various treaties concluded with these cities the claims of the Swiss Confederation were reserved. There were proposals for a larger league, to include Augsburg, Nürnberg, and Ulm; but the anomaly of such a formation was evident, and it could not be successfully carried into execution. The inclusion of Ulrich of Württemberg in the Christian Civic League, as proposed by Philip, was, happily, not brought about. The result of the diplomatic activity in which Zwingli had engaged under the influence of Philip of Hesse thus fell far short of its purpose.

To this new League, which made the Confederation impossible, the Catholic States replied by the "Christian Union." Austria had causes of complaint in the Waldshut incident and in the monastic secularisations. The monasteries of Stein-am-Rhein and Königsfelden, the former being under Austrian protection, and the latter an Austrian foundation, had been secularised (1524). Ferdinand protested; and reprisals followed on both sides. For its Italian policy Austria had need of Swiss support (it was hopeless, said one Austrian envoy, to hold Milan unless Switzerland were with the Emperor). At the Diet at Baden (May 28, 1528) Dr Jacob Sturzl, an envoy from Ferdinand—whose policy here agreed with the Emperor's—proposed to the Five Catholic Cantons, Luzern, Schwyz, Uri, Unterwalden, and Zug, a league with Austria, partly for defence and common religious ends. War was threatened; for, while the Imperial government was eager to attack Constance, Zurich and possibly Bern were equally bound to defend it, and also to chastise Unterwalden for violating Bernese territory.

It is impossible to follow in detail Austria's policy towards Switzerland: distinctions between the policies of Charles and Ferdinand, between the Councils at Ensisheim and Innsbruck, are easily traceable. And the chief advisers were not at one. Mark Sittich of Ems—the *Vogt* of Bregenz and the Vorarlberg—and Count Rudolf von Sulz, head of the Innsbruck Council, were for war; they were further urged on by the Bishop of Constance and the Abbot of St Gallen, who had private wrongs to redress. But the Habsburg lack of funds, and the impossibility of putting fresh taxes upon impoverished lands, made against war. The desirability of regaining the old lands of the Habsburgs was always present to their advisers; yet little could be done to compass it. On

the other side the dread of such an attack from "Pharaoh" was always in the mind of Zwingli, and sometimes found violent expression. But with the lapse of time he learnt that the Emperor could not always act as he would.

After lengthy negotiations the proposals for the Christian Union were drafted in a Diet at Feldkirch (February 14, 1529), and fully agreed to at Waldshut (April 22, 1529). The old faith was to be preserved and, as in 1525, a reformation on Catholic lines was to be carried out with the advice of the spiritual rulers. The members of the Union were bound to secure for each other the right of punishing heretics. A clause of doubtful interpretation about conquests showed that the possibility of such had been considered. This Union, which made a solid wall of Catholicism between South Germany and Switzerland, was, like the Civic League, a breaking-up of the old Confederation. It also looked for an extension beyond Switzerland: at the Diet of Speier (1529) Ferdinand discussed with Bavaria and the Bishop of Salzburg their entry into the Catholic League; Savoy was spoken of as likely to join it; the Valais also had (May, 1528) contracted a league for ten years with Savoy; even the Swabian League, it was said, might become a member. Bern and Zurich would then be enclosed by enemies.

The Diet of Speier (February 21, 1529) issued a severe decree against sects denying the Sacrament of the Flesh and Blood of Christ;—a distinction, which the Protestants had not as yet formally made for themselves, was made by others. Nine of the fourteen cities that signed the Protest presented on this occasion were Zwinglian. Strassburg, which was in disgrace at the Diet for having just abolished the Mass, drew closer to Zurich, from both political and theological motives. The distinction between Lutherans and Zwinglians on the subject of the Eucharist became now of political as well as dogmatic importance.

Events were tending towards war in Switzerland. Bern and Zurich had agreed (November 16–18, 1528) both to compel Unterwalden to pay the indemnity for invading Bernese territory, and also to protect the Reformed faith in the Common Lands, while the several communities were to be left free to decide for the Reformed or Catholic side. At a meeting of the Thurgau *Landsgemeinde* at Weinfelden (December 9, 1528) envoys of both the Catholic and Reformed Cantons attended; the latter promised help to those upon their side, and asked their help in return. The majority of the Thurgau communities decided for Reform. Meanwhile, the difficulties of a divided government in the Common Territories had become increasingly acute. Moreover, to the west, Geneva was attacked by Savoy, to which the Valais—now (end of 1528) allied to the Five Cantons—was attached, and the Christian Union supported Savoy. As these alliances tended to war, Schaffhausen, Appenzell, and the Graubünden offered mediation. But, as their terms did not include freedom of preaching, Zurich—firm on this point—

would not listen to them. Of the Five Cantons, Unterwalden was now the bitterest; but Luzern and Zurich—the rival leaders—had made up their mind for war (May 26–28). Bern, anxious to preserve unity, would not promise Zurich help for an offensive war. The demands of Zurich were indeed excessive; the surrender of the rights of the Cantons to the administration of the Abbey of St Gallen (to which Zurich, Luzern, Schwyz, and Glarus sent a protecting bailiff in turn every two years), the withdrawal from the Austrian alliance, and the surrender of the Luzern satirist, Thomas Murner.

Riotous proceedings at St Gallen were a further cause of war. In 1528 it was Zurich's turn to appoint the bailiff, who both attended to secular business and protected the Abbey; Zwingli meant to use the opportunity to further his cause. The Abbot Franz Geissberger was dying; Zwingli and the Privy Council bade (January 28, 1529) the Zurich official (Jacob Frei) seize the monastic property upon his death, secularise it, and introduce the Gospel. But the townsmen broke into the abbey (February 23) before the death of Geissberger (March 23). The monks elected as Abbot Kilian Käuffi, who fled to Bregenz, and thence resisted the plunder of his abbey lands. Since the abbey was under the protection of the Empire as well as of the four Cantons, and of these Luzern and Schwyz supported Käuffi, the illegal action of Zurich and of the townsmen could not but lead to war.

Nor did this incident stand alone: the delicate constitutional question of the Free Bailiwicks added to the intensity of feeling. Nearly all the villages in the district had declared (May, 1529) that they would follow Zurich, which was openly encouraging their violent changes; in all but religion they would obey their lords, the Catholic majority of the Cantons. These lords, however, hesitated to use force; but embassies regained for Catholicism some parishes. A new bailiff sent by Unterwalden was to take office in May (1529), and at first Zurich resolved to prevent his entry.

Bern did its utmost to keep the peace, but Zurich was embittered, while the Five Cantons had enough cause to reject Bern's mediation. Zurich declared war (June 8), and carried out a plan of campaign which Zwingli had drawn up; leaving small detachments at Muri and elsewhere, near the Bernese troops at Bremgarten (for Bern, which disliked offensive war, was yet willing to defend the Common Lands and Zurich if attacked), the main body moved to Kappel, ten miles from Zurich. Zwingli's plan was to move suddenly against the enemy; to force them to give up the Austrian alliance and their rule in the Common Lands, to renounce pensions, and to allow free preaching in their own territory. The Five Cantons, hoping to the last for Austrian help, were badly prepared: the troops of Luzern had gone to the Free Bailiwicks, but those of the other four Cantons moved from Zug towards Zurich. Hans Oebli, the *Landammann* of Glarus, hurried up to mediate; and, as he was a friend of Reform,

s voice, in spite of Zwingli's plea for war, prevailed. The rank and file of :ither army wished for war; and so, by the help of other Cantons, peace as negotiated by ambassadors, first at Aarau and then at Steinhausen Zug; the decision lay by custom with the armies themselves. Zwingli ished to force the abolition of pensions upon his opponents, but even , Zurich some were against this, and Bern, through Nicholas Manuel, fused to enforce it. Finally (June 24, 1529) peace was made at Kappel. either party was to attack the other for its faith. In the Common ands, the religious offenders should not be punished; the majority were , decide for or against the Mass and on other questions; only men of mour and moderation should be sent there as bailiffs. The Austrian liance was renounced, and its very documents were cut into shreds and urnt; the Five Cantons were to pay a war indemnity according to e decision of arbitrators, and, if it remained unpaid, Zurich and Bern ight close their markets to the Five Cantons. Finally the abolition of nsions and mercenary service was recommended to the Five Cantons. he removal of the Austrian alliance seemed to secure the advantage to urich, which still kept Hesse and its chance of France. One clause was terwards differently construed; it ran, that as faith cannot be planted r force no coercion should be used against the Five Cantons or their ople in matters touching their faith. The Zwinglians thought that e preaching extended to the Five Cantons as well as to the Common unds; and on the other hand the Five Cantons naturally held themves free to act as they pleased in their own territory. Thus the peace iich placed Zurich at the height of her power contained in itself the eds of future war. As a politician, if not as a theologian, Zwingli was stified in his preference for force. As early as August he thought other campaign inevitable.

In this same year the question of the Eucharist became of crucial iportance for the Protestants. In his writings of 1522 Zwingli had tered into no criticism of the accepted view. The interpretation, in ır Lord's saying, "This is my body," of the word "is" as "signifies" is possibly suggested to him by Cornelius van Hoen, after 1521, in circular letter carried about to theologians by Henne Rode. The pression of his opinion was hastened, if not caused, by Carlstadt's treme utterances, containing (as Zwingli thought) a kernel of truth dden by errors, and it first took shape in a letter to Matthaus Alber of eutlingen (November 16, 1524): the Eucharist was regarded as purely mbolical, but as a pledge of Christian profession; and he emphasised, his controversy with the Anabaptists shows, the corporate aspect in e Eucharist.

Zwingli's teaching, often presented as a mere negation of Luther's, s no less a negation of the doctrine of the Church. In spite of varying ws as to the exact nature of the Presence, its reality had always en admitted: Wiclif's denial of Transubstantiation and Luther's

assertion of Consubstantiation, although affecting the relation of the Presence to the elements, had not called in question that reality or the supernatural grace of this Sacrament itself. Zwingli, fastening upon the direct relation between God and the individual apart from outward acts, and starting from the human side, made this Sacrament purely symbolical, and brought it down from the supernatural to the human plane. In this he was followed by the later Sacramentarians, and was at one with the Socinians and more radical sects. He thus became the revolutionary theologian of the Reformation. While the Lutherans were sensitive to charges of a departure from the Catholic faith, the Zwinglians were conscious of their own bold innovations in doctrine and organisation (for instance, they did not hold Ordination essential). Their divergence from the Catholic Church went far deeper than objections to the Papacy or to current abuses; and thus the vision of a Council to promote union had no attraction or possibility for them. Hence the growth of their influence tended to perpetuate disunion.

The south German cities were led to favour Zwingli's views, not only from democratic sympathy with the Swiss, but from dislike of Luther's political allies, the Princes. Nürnberg was an exception: in 1525 Zwingli's books were forbidden there as "books of the Devil." But by April, 1527, most of the Augsburg preachers were on his side; at Ulm Conrad Sam was a pillar of strength to him; Ulrich of Württemberg, influenced by Œcolampadius and then by Zwingli's sermons (1524-5), became a strong Zwinglian, and in Hesse influenced the Landgrave in his turn; at Mainz, Hedio, who came from Basel (1523) corresponded with Zwingli; Frankfort, through Froschauer's connexion, became a literary centre of the "pure doctrine"; Strassburg, inspired by Zwingli, sent out its own teachers; and Zwinglianism, spreading down the Rhine, met a similar current of doctrine originating with van Hoen in Holland; it reached even Friesland, where Carl Stadt had worked, and Luther, unable to understand such a rapid growth, ascribed it to the Devil.

Haner, a theologian who differed from Luther in maintaining a purely spiritual eating and drinking of the Saviour's flesh and blood, and from Zwingli in maintaining a supernatural communication of grace, had suggested to the Landgrave Philip the possibility of a conference clearing up all differences. This advice, given at Speier in 1529, where unity among the Protestants was desirable for both political and religious reasons, led to the Marburg Conference (September, 1529). The character and issue of this Conference have been described elsewhere. The central subject was the change wrought by consecration in the elements. Zwingli purposely restricted the discussion to leave hope for unity; he had a practical mind, accustomed more than Luther's to the give and take of equal discussion. So long as unity was based upon ecclesiastical organisation, there had been scope for difference of opinion within one

Church; but now, when organic unity was lost, exact agreement of theological opinion and the names of certain leaders were made the essentials of the unity which it was sought to secure. Luther was the obstacle, as insisting that union of any kind should depend upon absolute agreement. But it is hard to see how Luther could have come into union with Zwingli, without joining in his political schemes; since the demand for a union between them was primarily political.

The failure to achieve theological unity ruined the great plan for a league which Zwingli and Philip of Hesse had conceived. Jacob Meier of Basel had spoken of some considerable plan to be discussed at Marburg; Zwingli's correspondence with the Landgrave and his visit to Strassburg had suggested many things to him; his request for an official delegate from the Zurich Council did not aim at theology alone. Unfortunately, the invitation to Bern was not sent until September 10, when it was too late. Religious differences made it clear that Saxony and Switzerland could not be included in the same league. However, Philip was ready to do without Saxony, and he was also ready to seek help from France, —an expedient which loyalty to the Empire made distasteful to Saxony The proposal of such a plan came from Philip; the exact details were afterwards filled in by Zwingli, inspired from Strassburg. Not only France but Venice was to be drawn into the league; and the instructions to Collin, the envoy there, were drawn up by Zwingli himself, as were many other State papers.

The activity and the expenditure of the French agents (Boisregault and Meigret) in Switzerland were great; the Most Christian King had no scruple about negotiations with heretics (who indeed were better than Turks); in March, 1531, he was ready to help Zurich secretly. But his great object was to keep the balance even in Switzerland; a war was not in his interest. On the other hand, the fear of arousing France paralysed the Emperor's action. Hence, while foreign influences pushed Switzerland to the verge of war, they also served to keep it back from war itself.

Diplomacy took up much of Zwingli's time, but his pen was as active as ever: he wrote commentaries upon Isaiah and Jeremiah, a number of important letters, and controversial tracts. His power at Zurich and the spirit of the city were at their height. In a complaint to Luzern about Thomas Murner (whose *Heretics' Calendar* seemed dangerous and offensive to an age over-sensitive to ridicule) the Council said (February 14, 1529) that they were free, and subject to no Emperor or lord; they, like France, Venice, and other States, ordered spiritual persons and property as they thought well. Zwingli's enemies too were now under his feet; after December 7, 1528, only the barest civic rights without the chance of office were left to non-Reformers; attendance at Mass even outside the city was punished by fine; to eat fish instead of flesh on Friday was an offence. But a reaction might at any time set in.

It was indeed the fear of such a reaction that led Zwingli to make his Reformation as thorough as possible.

In this period it becomes impossible to separate Swiss politics from German. The restoration of Duke Ulrich of Württemberg (which Zurich was more disposed than Bern to help) was an unfailing subject of negotiation. With this Saul who, could he but be restored, seemed likely to be a Paul to the Reformation, Zwingli had a connexion of long standing; and through him he became friendly with that able politician, the Landgrave Philip of Hesse. Zwingli's Hessian correspondence in cipher begins with the second Diet of Speier, when the Landgrave (April 22, 1529) first wrote about the Marburg Conference, and it ends eleven days before Zwingli's death. The two correspondents formed vast schemes, for the Landgrave, like Zwingli himself, was no rigid conservative. As early as 1524 Zwingli had formed a plan for an extensive league; but the Anabaptist troubles led him to lay it aside. Now under the Landgrave's influence he returned to it. After the Conference the proposal of "a Christian agreement" came from Hesse; it aimed at securing mutual protection and converts to the Word of God; the Schmalkaldic League (April, 1531) owed something to this conception. But the idea of a league uniting Swiss and German Protestants failed through resistance from the Elector of Saxony, faithful to the Empire and firm in his Lutheran creed.

The reward Zwingli gained for deserting his old principle of keeping aloof from foreign complications was small; his widest plans miscarried. No greater success rewarded Bucer in his attempts at mediation between the Lutheran and Zwinglian camps. The creed of Strassburg, Constance, Memmingen, and Lindau, drawn up by Bucer and Capito, presented to the Emperor July 11, 1530, and known as the *Tetrapolitana*, was considered and rejected by Basel and Zurich at the Evangelic Diet of Basel, November 16, 1530. It affirmed that the true body and blood of Christ were given, truly to eat and drink, for the nourishment of souls; positively, it made as close an approach to the Lutheran view as was possible, while by omission of any statement as to the elements it avoided contradicting that view; in other articles the authority of the Scriptures, not mentioned in the Augsburg Confession, and the rejection of images are set forth. Zwingli's own Confession was embodied in the *Fidei ratio ad Carolum Imperatorem* presented to the Emperor (July 3, 1530). The earlier sections expounded the Nicene faith; the sixth section emphasized Wyclif's theory of the invisible Church composed of elect believers; the seventh and eighth asserted the Sacraments to be merely signs and affirmed Zwingli's teaching in terms likely to anger Catholics and Lutherans alike; later sections depreciated ceremonies, denounced images as unscriptural, magnified the office of preacher, and discussed the relations of Church and State at length. The Anabaptists were often incidentally condemned, and the assertion of his own views was

clear and unflinching. No wish to conciliate others, no fear of a breach with the past is apparent.

Even when Strassburg (December, 1530) joined the Schmalkaldic League, Zwingli's desire for political union did not overcome his conscientious adherence to his own views. He was thus the obstacle in the negotiations at this stage (March–July, 1531), when the Elector of Saxony had yielded so far as to admit the adherents of the *Tetrapolitana* to the Schmalkaldic League. While he was willing to leave something vague, he could not accept definitions which he held to be untrue. Moreover, the Lutherans desired a General Council; while Zwingli had completely broken with tradition, and his organisation left no room for Councils.

Apart from doctrine, Zwinglianism on its political side was now (1530–1) a greater danger to the Empire than was Lutheranism. Ferdinand wrote to the Emperor after the battle of Kappel, that Switzerland was the head of German Protestantism, and to conquer it was the true way of mastering Germany and re-establishing religious peace; the papal Legate at Brussels wrote to Clement VII (May, 1531); "*Zurich est désormais la tête et la capitale de la secte Luthérienne.*" But her power was declining. It was only a small gain that Ulm (July, 1531), moved by the definite refusal of Electoral Saxony to alter its position, became more Zwinglian, or that Bern, whose support was essential to Zurich, rejected the *Tetrapolitana.* In Zurich itself Zwingli's influence was lessening; the unrestrained power of the Privy Council had grown distasteful, and the disaffected nobility was regaining power; on the question of an embassy to France (February, 1531), the opposition showed itself stronger than his followers. The trade of the city had been injured by political unrest; strict sumptuary laws and moral control led to discontent among the artisans and tradesmen, who regretted the monasteries; the sermons lost some of their old attraction. So keenly did Zwingli feel this change, that he formally asked leave to resign his preachership and go to work elsewhere (July 26). But he was too closely bound up with the town, and at the prayer of a deputation, made up of the two Burgomasters and the three chief Gild-masters, he kept his office; and for the last months of his life he retained, though precariously, something of his former influence.

Inside the Confederation war was again drawing nearer; the Catholic Cantons had still their own grievances and were embittered by defeat: they still—although against hope—looked to Austria for help. Zwingli, angry at the insults to which he was subjected, was decidedly for war ("The knot can only be loosed by firmness"). In this state of affairs the war of Musso kindled the flame. The castellan of Musso (di Medigino), since 1525 a troublesome neighbour of the Graubünden, had (March, 1531) murdered a Graubunden envoy returning from Milan, and invaded the Valtelline. The League appealed to the Swiss and

especially to Zurich. Zwingli believed that the Emperor stood behind the castellan, and that movements of troops in Austria foreshadowed an attack upon Zurich—an event which German politics made not unlikely. The Emperor did not indeed himself support the castellan, but he was inclined to approve the war, since it kept the dangerous Swiss employed, and he was not unwilling that Musso should be helped without expense to himself lest, if left without help, the castellan should turn to France. The Swiss Diet was divided by the Graubünden request. The Five Cantons refused help: the Protestants promised it. Zwingli again, in the Privy Council and in closest touch with the French ambassador Meigret, seized the opportunity to revive his far-reaching plan of alliance.

Political means were used for religious objects. An assembly of the Zwinglian allies (May 15) at Zurich determined that the Five Cantons must be forced to allow free way to preaching. An embargo upon trade by land—to check the passage of wine, wheat, salt, and iron—was to be set up against the Five Cantons. It was an unhappy method of compulsion, although it had a precedent in 1438, and had been contemplated in the First Peace of Kappel. The chief responsibility belongs to Bern, who suggested it as an alternative to the war proposed by Zurich. Things drifted nearer to war in spite of representations from France and from the other Cantons: scarcity of food distressed and angered the Catholics; Zurich would only remove the embargo if free preaching were allowed.

The Forest Cantons this time made the first move, and from Zug marched towards Zurich (October 4–9). When news of this reached Zurich, a small band, which in the end reached 1200, under George Göldli set out (October 9); a larger band of 1500 men fairly well equipped started two days later, and Zwingli accompanied them. But there was a lack of enthusiasm and even of preparation. In Bern the people blamed Zwingli for this "parsons' war." The action of Bern indeed was ambiguous; partly owing to trouble nearer home, and partly from aversion to the war. Her contingent was not ready until the crisis had passed. But there is no need to look for open treachery when a house is divided against itself.

The advance guard under Goldli—which was only to keep on the defensive—began the battle at Kappel on October 11; they neglected to charge the enemy when changing their attack, and their position was turned. When the main body under Rudolf Lavater reached the Albis —the position fixed by the Council—the day was practically lost. Its attack upon the 8000 Forest men failed. Zwingli was among the slain, and his body was treated disgracefully as that of a traitor. His stepson, Gerold Meyer, Diebold von Geroldseck, Abbot Joner of Kappel, and others of his friends, perished with him.

The remaining Zurich troops and allies came up (October 24) with the Catholic troops on the Gubel near Zug and were defeated in an

engagement more serious than the first. Zurich lay open to its enemies: the Emperor might now have intervened with effect. But through the mediation of the French ambassadors and the other Cantons peace was made (November 23): the conditions of the First Peace of Kappel were now reversed. It was to the credit of the victors that they did not press their success too far. Even now Zurich was not disposed for peace; but the country villages, which had lost by the embargo, here as at Bern were strongly for it. By the Second Peace of Kappel the territory of Zurich was kept intact: in the Common Lands existing beliefs were left alone, but Catholic minorities, where there were such, received protection; government by the majority of the Cantons was affirmed. The management of its own religious matters was left to each Canton. Zwingli's scheme to force the Catholic Cantons to give free play to the Reformation in the Common Lands and in their own territory had failed; but the principle of Federal control over religion was not asserted. The Christian Civic Alliance and the Treaty of 1529 were annulled. Basel, Schaffhausen, St Gallen, and Muhlhausen paid indemnities of from 1000 to 4000 crowns. Zurich and the town of St Gallen were to compensate and restore the Abbey of St Gallen: the Reformed communities in the Free Bailiwicks, Thurgau, and Toggenburg (where the Abbot regained his power), were allowed to keep their faith; Catholic, but not Reformed, minorities were protected. Monks and nuns might return to their Houses. Solothurn restored its old worship to escape the payment of an indemnity. Bern, which had to forego the compensation from Unterwalden, and Zurich were left discontented and almost bankrupt. Zurich was forced (December, 1531) to grant the Kappel Charter, by which its rural districts gained a right to be consulted upon all important questions, and to give or refuse their consent for any future war. Such was the outcome of Zwingli's ambitious scheme, whereby Bern and Zurich were to be the pillars of a great Protestant power in Switzerland, extending its influence far afield. The peace perpetuated division among the Reformers, and separated Switzerland from Germany. Glarus became Catholic once more; Bern grew more Lutheran; in the Common Lands the Aargau suffered most reaction, the Thurgau least. Zurich is henceforth externally of less importance. The future of Swiss Protestantism lay with Bern and Geneva, the latter not yet a Confederate, but in league with Bern and Freiburg (February, 1526).

And, furthermore, the Counter-Reformation, or the Catholic Reaction, (neither name aptly describes the movement or its origin) found a ready home in Switzerland. Catholicism began to gain ground here soon after the Second Treaty of Kappel, without having to wait for any of the stimulating movements felt elsewhere; the scheme of Catholic reform proposed in 1524-5, and the disasters of Zwinglianism were effective local causes

Outside Powers were unwilling to let the war die out; Philip of

Hesse, always ready and hopeful, tried to rouse it to new life; Basel was arming, but the south German towns urged peace. The Pope called upon the Emperor to make an end and put down the heresy at once, and even sent to the Five Cantons "*aliquantum pecuniae*": Ferdinand would have done the same, but was overruled by his advisers. The Austrian statesmen hoped to use the war for the Emperor's good, but to do so without expense: and the Emperor feared by any decisive step to rouse the French to war. The French on their part gained greatly by the Peace. Thus the settlement remained undisturbed, and the south German towns drew nearer to the Princes now that Zurich could give them no help.

In Zurich itself the religious movement continued: Bullinger, Zwingli's son-in-law and successor, banished from Bremgarten by the Peace, carried on his work; but it was now solely theological and internal; the Privy Council was discredited, as Bullinger explained to Myconius. Its existence meant foreign entanglements. And Zurich, weakened by the new power given to the country districts, became less and less able to pursue an adventurous foreign policy among the great States of Europe.

But the strife of doctrine remained behind, always significant for the history of thought, at times for politics as well. Bucer's task of mediation grew harder and its end more remote. Conferences with Melanchthon had no result, because it was impossible to devise a formula such as would satisfy Luther and still recognise the conflicting doctrines adapted to minds of different types. At Wittenberg (May 22–27, 1536) a well-attended Conference produced a conciliatory document, the *Wittenberg Concord.* According to it, the body and blood of Christ were truly and substantially present in the Eucharist, shown and received. Bucer, by a distinction not widely accepted, contended that the impious did not, while the merely unworthy did, receive them. To this view Strassburg, Augsburg, Ulm, Constance, and other cities agreed. But Luther hesitated to sign the Concord because he heard the Swiss had agreed to it, and feared it must therefore be bad.

On the other hand, in the previous January, the Swiss theologians had met at Basel and there drawn up the First Helvetic Confession. It was conciliatory in tone, and went beyond the purely symbolic view, the *nuda signa*, of Zwingli. But its framers were not at Wittenberg; and Bucer, the medium of intercourse, did not adequately represent one side to the other. Another Conference of the Swiss Reformers at Basel drafted a new document, showing a wish for unity, and at the same time making it clear why the Wittenberg Concord could not possibly be accepted. Luther's reply (1537) was guarded and distrustful, so that its circulation in Switzerland did not help the cause which Bucer and Melanchthon had at heart. A Conference at Zurich (April 28, 1538) showed the politicians as eager for unity as the theologians for distinction. Finally, Zurich (September 28, 1538) resolved to keep to her old view with no

modifications. If doctrine was to be the basis of unity, the adjustment of the limits of difference required nice discussion. Luther's violence of language, and Zwingli's mingling of politics and theology, had complicated that discussion; henceforth, old positions eagerly guarded and attacked, associations and repugnances valued above their real importance, were further obstacles to union. But it was hard to give any strong religious reasons why unity as distinct from charity should be sought. Political reasons there were in plenty, but their admission made the discussions theologically lifeless.

Calvin may have learnt much of organisation from Zurich; but in theological importance he overshadows not only Zwingli but all other Swiss reformers. As to the Eucharist, while Zwinglian in his exegesis he was more spiritual in his conceptions, emphasising the grace conferred, while not connecting it with the elements; a change which has also been detected in Bullinger and later Zwinglians. But they agreed in rejecting Luther's doctrine. Like Bucer Calvin worked for unity, and unlike Zwingli did not spread his political energies over too large a field. He was thus able to concentrate and deepen influences set in motion by Zwingli. But even Calvin's labours for unity had a political end: if to observers from the outside German and French Protestants could appear united, the French King, ally of the one, could not well persecute the other. Calvin and Bullinger drew up (1549) the *Consensus Tigurinus*—strongly anti-Lutheran in tone (*perversa et impia superstitio est ipsum Christum sub elementis includere*). Up to this time there had been a division among the Swiss leaders: Bullinger had given up all hope of unity with the Lutherans: at Bern, with its Lutheran inclinations, that hope was still alive. But with the *Consensus* Protestant Switzerland was united. Basel, with traditions of synods of its own, Bern, with a distrust of all synods as leading to strife, did not welcome it greatly, but yet adopted it (1551); so did Schaffhausen, St Gallen, Biel, and Mühlhausen. Thus in the end dogmatic and political unity—which had so often helped or thwarted each other—claimed a common territory in Reformed Switzerland. And the reaction following upon Zwingli's strict control brought a growth of toleration. In Germany, meanwhile, the teaching of Zwingli became nominally less important than that of Calvin, and the division between Reformed and Lutheran—so fatal to German Protestantism—belongs in its later stages more to the history of Calvinism than of Zwinglianism. But Zwingli in his treatment of the Eucharist had raised a fundamental issue; and his views on this head, like his treatment of public worship, have had a wider influence than their recognition in Confessions and Liturgies would indicate. Thus Zwinglianism became the name of a school of thought rather than of a religious body.

Zwingli's plans would have given the Confederation unity and cohesion at the expense of his opponents. But the Reformation postponed

the solution of the unsolved problem of Swiss unity; and the Counter-Reformation made the difficulties greater. Cardinal Carlo Borromeo, Archbishop of Milan, took a deep interest in Switzerland: he founded a Swiss College at Milan, introduced into the land the Jesuits (1574–81) and the Capuchins (1581–8), and procured a permanent nunciature at Luzern. After his death Luzern, under Ludwig Pfyffer, formed a league with Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Zug, Solothurn, and Freiburg to maintain offensively and defensively the Catholic Faith (1586): this was known as the Borromean League. Thus the division into two camps was crystallised, and the old Federal Constitution was almost dissolved: Diets—save those of the opposed Cantons held separately—became rare. The disputes about the Common Lands went on and with foreign influences intensified the differences due to faith. In the Thirty Years' War the Protestants expressly and the Catholics tacitly adopted neutrality, but could not hold entirely aloof. The country's importance to its neighbours lay in its provision of soldiers for hire, and for this reason they endured its independence. The neutrality adopted was not that advocated yet departed from by Zwingli: it resulted from the religious divisions due to him, combined with the foreign service he condemned.

The Reformation in Switzerland shows how largely the forms in which religious ideas express themselves are moulded by political forces. It was also more than elsewhere the centre of the national history. It was Zwingli who, by his religious influence, and his political mistakes, was the cause of this. Politically his dearest schemes miscarried; ecclesiastically his type of organisation and worship endured; doctrinally he was overshadowed by others. But the permanent division of the Cantons was due to him: not merely to the doctrines he taught, but on the one hand to the power with which he impressed them upon Zurich, and on the other, to the energy and violence with which, regardless of Federal liberties, he strove to force them upon the other Cantons.

CHAPTER XI.

CALVIN AND THE REFORMED CHURCH.

The Reformation emerges as an inevitable result from the interaction and opposition of many and complex forces. The spirit of the time, even when intending to be its enemy, proved its friend. The Renaissance, which had raised the ancient classical world from its grave, was not in itself opposed to the Catholic Church; but in the reason it educated and the historical temper it formed, in the literature it recovered and the languages it loved, in the imagination it cultivated and the new sense of the beautiful it created, there were forces of subtle hostility to the system which had been built upon the ruins of classical antiquity. Erasmus used his wit to mock the vulgar scholasticism of Luther. But Erasmus more than any man made Protestantism necessary and the Papacy impossible, especially to the grave and reverent peoples of the North. The navigators, who by finding new continents enlarged our notions both of the earth and man, seemed but to add fresh provinces to Rome; but, by moving the centre of social and intellectual gravity from the shores of the Mediterranean to those of the Atlantic, they inflicted on her a fatal wound. Moreover, by the easy acquisition of the wealth which lower races had accumulated, there was begotten in the Latin peoples so fierce and intolerant an avarice that their highest ambitions appeared ignoble, in contrast with the magnanimity and the enterprise of the Teutonic nations that became Protestant.

And just as the history of man's past lengthened and the earth around him broadened and with it his horizon, so the nature beneath him and the heavens above began by telling him their secrets to throw over him their spell. With the new knowledge of nature came new hopes which looked more to the energies that were creating the future than to the authorities that had fashioned the past. Faith in man as man, and not simply as King or noble, as Pope or priest, was reborn; and he appeared as the maker of history and the doer of the deeds that distinguish time. The most famous of the humanists were either themselves poor or sons of poor men, though they might affect, especially in Italy, the Courts of Kings and the palaces of the great, who had patronage as well as

power in their hands. The most eminent of the explorers was a Genoese sailor; the best known conqueror was an officer's bastard; the author of the new astronomy was a clerk who never became a priest; the foremost scholar of the day was a child born out of wedlock; the most acute political thinker was a plain Florentine citizen; and the most potent English statesman was the son of a rustic tradesman. And this strenuous individualism found its counterpart in religion; the rights of man in religion were declared; the individual asserted his competence to know and to obey the truth by which he was to be judged.

But the Reformation, at least in its earlier phase, bore also upon its face the image of the man whose genius gave it actual being. Luther had become a Reformer rather by necessity of nature than by choice of will. His peasant descent may have given him a conservative obstinacy which was concentrated and intensified by his narrow scholastic education. No man ever clung with more tender intensity to the customs and beliefs that could be saved from the wreckage of the past. But he did his work as a Reformer the more thoroughly because he did it from nature rather than from choice. It is doubtful if in the whole of history any man ever showed more of the insight that changes audacity into courage. By the publication of his Theses he proclaimed a doctrine of grace that broke up the system which Europe had for centuries believed and obeyed. By burning the papal Bull he defied an authority which no person or people had been able to resist and yet live. By his address to the nobles of the German nation he appealed from ecclesiastical passion and prejudice to secular honour and honesty. By his appearance and conduct at the Diet of Worms he showed that he could act as he had spoken. By his translation of the Bible he spread before the eyes of every religious man the law by which he was bound. And by his marriage he declared the sanctity of the home and the ties which attached man to woman.

But, though Luther was by nature strong and heroic, he was yet so intellectually timid that he could not bear suspense of judgment, even where such suspense was an obvious duty. And so the system he created was, alike in what it sacrificed and what it spared, a splendid example of dialectical adaptation to personal experience. He was indeed so typical a German that his Church suited the German people; but for the same reason it could not live outside Teutonic institutions and the Teutonic mind. He had no constitutional tendency to scepticism, for his convictions did not so much follow or obey as underlie and guide the processes of his logic. Hence he was a man equally powerful in promoting and in resisting change; he stood up against forces that would have overwhelmed a weaker or a smaller man; but as a conservative by nature he professed beliefs that a man of a more consistent intellect would have dismissed, and cherished customs which a more radical reformer would have surrendered. And he was not conscious

of any incompatibility among the things he retained or of any coherence between what he gave up and what he spared. Thus he opposed to the authority of the Pope the authority of Holy Scripture; but the Apostle who seemed to ignore or deny his most fundamental belief he was ready to denounce as if he were the Pope. He appealed to the German people to uphold against Rome a Gospel which declared all men to be equal before God; but, when the peasants drew from his first principle an inference which justified their revolt, he sided with the Princes. From his doctrine of Justification by Faith he argued against the papal chair and its claims; but his theory of the Eucharistic Sacrament was more full of mysteries that tax the reason than any of the articles which he regarded as specifically Popish. He held freedom to be the right of every Christian man, and confessed himself bound to accept every consequence which came by legitimate reasoning from the truth he acknowledged; but he refused the right hand of brotherhood to Reformers whose love of freedom, integrity of character, purity of motive, and zeal in the faith were equal to his own.

The longer the Protestant Church lived, the more the Reformer's inconsistencies and the inadequacy of his Reformation became evident; and so a double result followed. On the one side the ancient Church pressed with growing severity upon the revolt and its leaders; and, on the other side, the more eager of the rebellious spirits went forward in search of simpler yet more secure positions. Rome did not indeed understand at once what had happened; but she understood enough to see how Luther and the communities he had founded could best be dealt with. An ancient Church which has governed man for centuries, instructed him, organised and administered his worship, consecrated him from his birth and comforted him in his death, has always an enormous reserve of energy. Man is a being with an infinite capacity for reverence; and it is where he most reveres that he is most conservative and least inclined to change. And consequences soon followed from the Reformation which threatened to limit its scope to the purification of Catholicism, to the restoration of its decayed energies, and to furnishing it with the opportunity of vindicating by policy and argument, by speech and action, its name and its claims. Heresies soon arose in the Protestant as they had arisen in the early Church; the collision of the new thought with the old associations provoked discussion; discussion begat differences; differences became acute antitheses which were hardened into permanence by the very means taken to soften or overcome them. Anabaptism supplied Catholicism with fruitful illustrations of the dangers incident to freedom of thought; the Peasants' War was made to point a moral which appealed to the jealousy of nobles and the ambitions of Kings; the rise of sectaries and the multiplication of sects were employed to set off the excellence of a uniform faith and an infallible Church; the abolition of priesthood and hierarchy was used to unchurch

the heretic and deny to his societies both divine authority and sacramental grace. Revival and reaction followed so fast on the heels of reform that, had the Lutheran Church stood alone, neither the eloquence of its founder, nor the sagacity and steadfastness of the Saxon Electors, nor the vigour of Landgrave Philip could have saved it.

But Luther did not exhaust the tendencies that worked for Reform. They were impersonated also in Zwingli. As the one was by disposition and discipline a schoolman who loved the Saints and the Sacraments of the Church, the other was a humanist who appreciated the thinkers of antiquity and the reason in whose name they spoke. Luther never escaped from the feelings of the monk and the associations of the cloister; but Zwingli studied his New Testament with a fine sense of the sanity of its thought, the combined purity and practicability of its ideals, and the majesty of its spirit; and his ambition was to realise a religion after its model, free from the traditions and superstitions of men. It was this that made him so tolerant of Luther, and Luther so intolerant of him. The differences of opinion might have been transcended, but the differences of character were insuperable. The two men stood for distinct ideals and different realities; and as they differed so did their peoples. Differences of political order, geographical situation, and climate could not but reappear in character and in belief as well as in the forms under which these were co-ordinated and expressed. Ecclesiastical order will ever reflect the civil polity prevailing in the region where it is evolved. Thus the Roman Church was built upon the ruins of the Roman Empire; the Eastern patriarchates were organised according to the methods and the offices of Byzantine rule; and the ecclesiastical institutions of the sixteenth century were shaped by the political capacities and usages of the peoples among whom and for whom they were created. Thus the Church adapted to a German kingdom was not suited to the temper and ways of an ancient republic; nor was a system fitted to a despotic State congenial to the genius of a free people. Hence there emerged a twofold difference between the Reformations accomplished by Luther and by Zwingli: one personal, which mainly affected the faith or creed of the Church, another social or civil, which mainly affected its polity. Luther, a schoolman while a Reformer, created out of his learning and experience a faith suited to his personal needs; but Zwingli, a Reformer because a humanist, came to religion through the literature which embodied the mind of Christ and the Church of the Apostles. Hence, the Lutheran Reformation is less radical and complete than the Zwinglian, while its faith is more traditional and less historical and rational. But the differences due to the political order and the civil usage were, if not deeper, yet more divisive. Luther effected his change under an empire and within a kingdom by the help of Princes and nobles; but Zwingli effected his under a republic by the aid of citizens with whom he had to argue as with consciously freeborn men. Both

might organise their respective Churches by means of the civil power and in dependence on it; but the civil powers were not the same, the reigning forces being in the one case the law and the princely will, and in the other case the reason and the free choice of men trained in self-government by the usages of centuries. The Lutheran Church was thus more monarchical, the Zwinglian more republican in constitution; the one was constructed by Princes, the other organised by the genius and built by the hands of a free people.

The Reformation, then, could not possibly be expressed in a single homogeneous form. Organisation was a necessity, if the liberty achieved by the movement was to be preserved; but it is a much harder thing to establish an order agreeable to liberty than an order suitable to bondage. When a revolution once begins, authorities, personal or political, may retard or deflect it, but they cannot stop or turn it back. And no revolution leaves man exactly where it found him; the wheel may accomplish its full round, but it never returns to the point whence it started. If, then, man could not go back and must preserve what he had gained, he needed a system that would serve his new mind as Catholicism had served his old. Out of Luther's Reformation came the Church which bears his name; out of Zwingli's the Church which is specially termed the Reformed. This Church was born in Switzerland, but named in France; and the name signified that while it was a Church Protestant and Evangelical like the Lutheran, it was yet ancient and continuous like the Roman, able to change its form or accidents without losing its essence. Being Swiss by birth it was republican in polity and democratic in spirit, a Church freely chosen by a free people and capable of living amid free institutions. But France, in adopting and naming it, made it less national and more cosmopolitan, helping it to realise a character at once more comprehensive and aggressive. Now, the causes of this action may be described as at once general and particular, or national and personal. Of the more general, or national, causes three may here be specified.

French Protestantism was more a lay than a clerical revolt; the men who led and who formed it were without the mental habits or the associations of the priest. At first indeed it was termed, just as if it had been imported from Germany, "the Lutheran heresy"; but the most notable of the early French martyrs, Louis de Berquin, was a pupil of Erasmus rather than of Luther. The men who made the psalms which the French Protestants loved to sing, were not of the priestly order, while their two most illustrious teachers were both jurists and scholars. It was then but characteristic that the Reformed Church of France should more emphasise moral character and temper than custom or formulated beliefs, and that John Calvin, who was its most creative personality, should not think like a schoolman or appeal to the

Imitatio Christi as Luther had appealed to the *Theologia Germanica*. Its genius was to sacrifice everything which Scripture did not directly sanction and justify; while the genius of the Lutheran Church was to spare everything that Scripture did not expressly forbid. And these differences were felt and resented by the Lutherans long before they were perceived or appreciated by the Catholics; for one of the most tragic things of history is the jealousy which made the Lutherans so fear the Reformed Church that they would at one time rather have seen Rome than Geneva victorious.

Again, the Reformed Church in France had to live in the face of a persecution so severe and a legislation so repressive as to be without parallel in the annals of any civilised country. Certainly, in the case of the early Church the martyrdoms were numerically fewer, while its sufferings were less continuous and its period of persecution not so unbroken and protracted. The Roman amphitheatre was, compared with the Place Maubert, a home of mild humanity; the gay and careless intolerance of Francis I had nothing to learn from pagan hate, while the Inquisition was a fiercer and more pitiless foe than heathenism could have bred. The first martyrdoms took place in 1523 at Meaux and at Paris; by 1526 they had become common. An eye-witness tells us that in six months—1534-5—in Paris alone twenty-seven persons were burned to death. And in 1568, as if to show how the thirst for blood had grown, two Huguenot writers assure us that, during the short peace, in three months more than "ten thousand" people were slain, a statement which the testimony of the Venetian ambassador abundantly confirms. In 1581 a book dedicated to Henry III places the number who had fallen within the few preceding years for the "Religion" at two hundred thousand, and it goes on to enumerate the victims provided by the larger Churches.

These figures may be exaggerated; but the exaggerations, which are those of contemporaries, will seem extravagant only to those who have never looked into the records of congregations and classes. In any case the figures witness to the fierceness of the fires that scorched the Reformed Church in France, and explain if they do not justify "its passion of religious hate," while they drew to it the pity and awakened for it the admiration of all its sister and daughter communities. To define policy and shape character in their own and other lands, for their own and later ages, has ever been the prerogative of the persecuted. And this prerogative the Huguenot has exercised as a splendid revenge. He had no opportunity of becoming a loyal citizen; the State would not allow him. L'Hôpital laid down the principle that there could be no civil unity where there was religious dissension; and that the city which allowed its citizens to disagree in their theological beliefs could know no peace. While he urged the sectaries to cultivate charity, and cease to use the "*mots diaboliques*" which they flung at each other, and to employ instead

the truest and most characteristic of names—"Christian," yet his thought translated into law rendered, so far as the Huguenot was concerned, duty to the State and duty to conscience incompatible. And the tragic struggle in which the Huguenot was engaged made him a heroic and a potent figure. What the French Revolution did later for the European peoples, the Huguenot did for Protestantism. He made his faith illustrious; his example became infectious, and the Churches of other lands loved to emulate the Reformed Church of France. And this effect was at once intensified and heightened by the expulsive power of the anti-Protestant legislation. It drove men out of France without expelling their love of France; they only loved her the more that she had made them fugitives for conscience' sake. Men like John Calvin and Theodore Beza did not cease to be sons of France though they became citizens of Geneva; and they used their foreign citizenship to serve their mother land more effectually than they could have done in any of her own cities. The Protestants failed in France, yet it is doubtful whether without their failure there the Reformed Church could have prospered The events that so tended to define its creed and demeanour, helped it to fight its battles the more bravely.

Finally, the Reformed Church as organised by the French mind belongs essentially to the second Protestant generation, and its distinctive note was an enlarged historical knowledge and a clarified historical sense. The feeling for religion was in the second generation not less strong than in the first; but it knew better the problem to be solved and had become more conscious of the many and complex factors required for its solution. The new literature had almost nothing to do with determining the minds and motives of the earlier Reformers; but determined almost exclusively those of the later. With the exception of Melanchthon no Lutheran of the front rank came from the humanists, but all the creative minds of the Reformed Church were children of the Renaissance. The problem as they saw it was historical and literary as well as religious. The Old Testament which Reuchlin had recovered and the New Testament which Erasmus had published and interpreted enabled them to study both the religion which Christ had found and the religion which He had made; the Apostolic writings showed how the men who knew Him or who knew those who knew Him understood and tried to realise His mind. Their own experience had set them face to face with a Church and system which claimed to express the mind of the Apostles and to represent the apostolical society. They were not curious and scientific enquirers who wished to discover how the one had become the other, or how the twin laws of continuity and change had fulfilled themselves in history; they were convinced and sincere religious men, who studied first the Scriptures to find the idea of Christ, and then their own times to see whether it had been and how it could be realised.

There was thus an objectivity in the Reformed ideal which was absent

from the Lutheran; a greater thoroughness, a more comprehensive spirit, a more conscious and coherent endeavour to repeat and reflect the Apostolic age. The Reformed Church was not built to meet the exigencies of an expanding personal experience, but articulated throughout according to a consciously conceived idea. It bore indeed even more than the Lutheran the impress of a single mind; but then that mind was as typical of France and the second Protestant generation as Luther was typical of Germany and the first; and it had come by a very different process and way to the convictions which drove it into action. Calvin, like Zwingli, was a humanist before he became a Reformer, and what he was at first he never ceased to be. On the intellectual side, as a scholar and thinker, his affinities were with Erasmus, though on the religious side they were rather with Luther; indeed, Calvin can hardly be better described than by saying that his mind was the mind of Erasmus, though his faith and conscience were those of Luther. He had the clear reason and the open vision of the one, but the religious fire and moral passion of the other. The conscience made the intellect constructive, the intellect made the conscience imperious—at once individual, architectonic, and collective. In Calvin the historical sense of the humanist, and the spiritual passion of the Reformer, are united; he knows the sacred literature which his reason has analysed, while his imagination has seen the Apostolic Church as an ideal which his conscience feels bound to realise. There was rigorous logic in all he did; dialectic governed him, from the humanism which furnished his premisses to the religion which built up his conclusions. This is the man whom we must learn to know, if we would understand the Reformed Church, what it did, and what it became in his hands.

The personal cause, then, which most of all contributed to the creation of the Reformed Church, as history knows it, is John Calvin; and him we must here attempt to understand from two points of view: first, that of descent and education; secondly, that of the place and sphere in which he did his work.

Calvin was born on July 10, 1509, at Noyon, in Picardy. It was the year when Henry VIII had succeeded to the English throne; when Colet was meditating the formation of a school which was to bear the name of the Apostle whom he loved; when Erasmus, learned and famous, was in Rome, holding high argument with the Cardinal de' Medici; when Luther attained the dignity of *Sententiarius*, and had been called to Wittenberg; and when Melanchthon, though only a boy of thirteen, matriculated at Heidelberg. Calvin's ancestors had been bargemen on the Oise; but his father, Gérard Calvin, had forsaken the ancestral craft, and had sometime before 1481 migrated from Pont l'Évêque to Noyon, where he had prospered, and had in due course become *Notaire apostolique, Procureur fiscal du Comté, Scribe en Cour d'Église, Secrétaire de*

l'Évesché, et Promoteur du Chapitre. He married Jeanne le Franc, the daughter of a well-to-do and retired innkeeper, described by a Catholic historian as a "most beautiful woman," and by a local tradition as "remarkably devout." Beza says that the family was honourable and of moderate means; and he adds that the father was a man of good understanding and counsel, and therefore much in request among the neighbouring nobility. To this couple were born four sons and two daughters, John being the second son. The father, who intended the boy for the Church, had the successful man's belief in a liberal education, and obtained for him, just as the modern father seeks a scholarship or exhibition, first, the revenues of a chapel in the cathedral, and some years later those of a neighbouring curacy. Among the local gentry was the distinguished family of Montmor. One of them, Charles de Hangest, was from 1501 to 1525 Bishop of Noyon; and his nephew Jean held the same episcopate for the succeeding fifty-two years. This Jean quarrelled lustily with the Chapter, which disliked his manners, his dress, his beard, and possibly also the tolerance of heresy which made him "*suspect dans sa foi et odieux à l'Église et à l'État.*" It is probable that his friendship with this episcopal race helped Gérard to rise, and also hastened his fall. Whatever the cause—whether financial embarrassments, personal attachments, dubious orthodoxy, or all three combined—his later years were more troubled than his earlier; and he died in 1531 under the Ban of the Church. There is no evidence of any latent Protestantism either in him or in his family at this time, though four years later John had become the hope of the stern and unbending Reformers, and within five years the eldest son Charles had died as *une âme damnée*, for he refused on his deathbed to receive the Sacraments of the Church.

Calvin's education began in the bosom of the Montmor family, not indeed as a matter of charity, but, as Beza tells us, at the charges of his father; and though Calvin never forgot that he was "*unus de plebe homuncio,*" yet he was always grateful for the early associations which gave to his mind and bearing a characteristic distinction. In 1523 he was sent to Paris, where he entered as a student of Arts the College de la Marche, whence he passed, for his later and more special studies, to the College de Montaigu. The University of Paris was old and famous, but its then state was not equal to its age or its fame. Erasmus describes how the students were mobbed and hunted on the streets, the sort of houses, no better than *lupanaria*, which they frequented or lodged in, the filthy language they heard or used, the still filthier deeds they were expected to do or suffer. Rabelais' Panurge comes to Paris skilled in a host of tongues, but *malfaisant, pipeur, beuveur, bateur de pavéz, ribleur,* averse to no form of mischief or pruriency. James Dryander, brother of Francis, one of Calvin's innumerable correspondents, describes the *præceptorculi* and the *magistelli* of the University as

amazing the students by the impudence and ineptitude with which they explained authors whom they did not understand. And how did the boy of fourteen conduct himself in this, to him, strange atmosphere? We need not trust the admiring or depreciative narratives of later men; but we may judge the lad by the friends he made.

Foremost among these stand the four Cops. The father, Guillaume Cop, the King's physician, correspondent of Reuchlin and friend of Erasmus, who praised him as of medicine the *vindex et antistes*, and as *Musarum cultor*, and the sons—Jean, who became a canon of the Church; Nicolas, who in 1530 became a professor of philosophy, and in 1533 delivered as Rector of the University an address which made both him and Calvin famous; and the youngest of the brothers, Michel, who followed Calvin to Geneva and became a Protestant pastor. Beside the Cops there stands another Erasmian, Guillaume Budé, of whom Calvin in his earliest work spoke as "*primum rei literariae decus et columen, cuius beneficio palmam eruditionis hodie sibi vendicat nostra Gallia.*" One of the regents of the College de la Marche was Mathurin Cordier, an enthusiastic teacher who loved learning and learners, and whose keen eye saw the rich promise hidden in his new scholar. The relations of master and pupil were almost ideal. Calvin never ceased to regard Cordier with affection, dedicating to him in profound but reserved gratitude one of his commentaries; Cordier ever respected Calvin, and showed his respect by becoming, like him, a Protestant, and following him to Geneva, where he died, though thirty-two years Calvin's senior, in the same year as his quondam pupil.

And here, perhaps, we may most fitly glance at the commonest of all the charges brought against Calvin. He is said to have been even then austere, severe, harsh, intolerant, inaccessible to the softer emotions, well entitled to bear the name which the playful companions of his youth gave him, "the Accusative." But how stand the facts? There is no scholar of his time more distinguished by his willingness to serve friends or his power to attach and bind them to himself by bands of steel. Of the de Montmors, with whom he was educated, almost all, in spite of high ecclesiastical connexions and hopes, became Protestants, while to his old fellow-pupil, Claude, he dedicated the firstfruits of his literary genius. The Cops and Cordier have already been noticed; and, though Budé did not himself cease to be a Catholic, yet his wife and family all became Protestants, five of them on his death in 1549 seeking refuge in Geneva. Another early teacher whom Calvin deeply revered, expressing his reverence in one of his most characteristic dedications, was the Lutheran Melchior Wolmar, to whom he owed his introduction to the Greek language and literature. But if one would understand the young Calvin, one must study him as revealed in his letters to friends and companions like François Connan, whom he describes as the wisest and most learned of men, whom he trusts above all others, and whose advice he rejoices to

follow; or François Daniel, whom Calvin salutes as "*amice incomparabilis*," or as "*frater et amice integerrime*"; or Nicolas du Chemin, whom he rallies on his literary ambitions, and addresses as "*mea vita charior*." The man is here revealed as nature made him, and before he had to struggle against grim death for what was dearer to him than life; affectionate and delicate, not in body, but in spirit.

In 1528 Calvin's father, perhaps illuminated by the disputes in his Cathedral Chapter, discovered that the law was a surer road to wealth and honour than the Church, and decided that his son should leave theology for jurisprudence. The son, nothing loth, obeyed, and left Paris for Orleans, possibly, as he descended the steps of the College de Montaigu, brushing shoulders with a Spanish freshman named Ignatius Loyola. In Orleans Calvin studied law under Pierre de l'Estoile, who is described as *jurisconsultorum Gallorum facile princeps*, and as eclipsing in classical knowledge Reuchlin, Aleander, and Erasmus; and Greek under Wolmar, in whose house he met for the first time Theodore Beza, then a boy about ten years of age. After a year in Orleans he went to Bourges, attracted by the fame of the Italian jurist Alciati, whose ungainliness of body and speech and vanity of mind his students loved to satirise and even by occasional rebellion to chasten. In 1531 Gérard Calvin died and his son in 1532 published his first work, a Commentary on Seneca's *De Clementia*. His purpose has been construed by the light of his later career; and some have seen in the book a veiled defence of the Huguenot martyrs, others a cryptic censure of Francis I, and yet others a prophetic dissociation of himself from Stoicism. But there is no mystery in the matter; the work is that of a scholar who has no special interest in either theology or the Bible. This may be statistically illustrated: Calvin cites twenty-two Greek authors and fifty-five Latin, the quotations being most abundant and from many books; but in his whole treatise there are only three Biblical texts expressly cited, and those from the Vulgate. The man is cultivated and learned, writes elegant Latin, is a good judge of Latinity, criticises like any modern the mind and style, the knowledge and philosophy, the manner, the purpose, and the ethical ideas of Seneca; but the passion for religion has not as yet penetrated as it did later into his very bones. Erasmus is in Calvin's eyes the ornament of letters, though his large edition of Seneca is not all it ought to have been; but even Erasmus could not at twenty-three have produced a work so finished in its scholarship, so real in its learning, or so wide in its outlook.

What gives the book significance is the nature that shines through it; the humanist is a man with a passion for conduct, moral, veracious, strenuous, who has loved labour and bestowed it without grudging on the classical writer with whom he has most affinity. Of the twin pillars of Roman philosophy and eloquence Cicero is for him an easy first, but Seneca is a clear second. Calvin is here at once a jurist and a scholar,

but amid his grammatical, literary, and historical discussions—every phrase and idea interpreted being illustrated from classical authorities—he speaks his mind with astonishing courage concerning the qualities and faults of kings and judges, States and societies. He bids monarchs remember that their best guardians are not armies or treasuries, but the fidelity of friends and the love of subjects. Arrogance may be natural in a prince, but it does not therefore cease to be an evil. A sovereign may ravage like a wild beast, but his reign will be robbery and oppression, and the robber is ever the enemy of man. Cruelty makes a king execrable; and he will be loved only as he imitates the gentleness of God. And so clemency is true humanity; it is a heroic virtue, hard to practise, yet without it we cannot be men. And he uses it to qualify the Stoic ethics; pity is not to him a disease of the soul, it is a sign and condition of health; no good man is without pity; the Athenians did well when they built an altar to this virtue. Cicero and even Juvenal teach us that it is a vice not to be able to weep. And the doctrine becomes in Calvin's hands social; man pitiful to men will be sensible of their rights and his own duties Conscience is necessary for us, but his good name is necessary to our neighbour; and we must not so follow our conscience as to injure his good name. We ought so to follow nature that others may see the reason in the nature that we follow. He can be humorous, and laughs at the ridiculous ceremonies which accompanied the apotheosis of Caesar, or at the soothsayers who prophesied without smiling; but he is usually serious and grave, criticising Seneca for speaking of Fortune instead of God, and the Stoics for doctrines which make human nature good, yet isolate the good man from mankind. The ethics of the Stoics he loved, but not their metaphysics; their moral individualism and their forensic morality he admired, but the defects of their social and collective ideals he deplored and condemned. The humanist is alive with moral and political enthusiasm, but the Reformer is not yet born.

The events of the next few months are obscure, but we know enough to see how forces, internal and external, were working towards change. In the second half of 1532 and the earlier half of 1533 Calvin was in Orleans, studying, teaching, practising the law, and acting in the University as Proctor for the Picard nation; then he went to Noyon, and in October he was once more in Paris. The capital was agitated; Francis was absent, and his sister, Margaret of Navarre, held her Court there, favouring the new doctrines, encouraging the preachers, the chief among them being her own almoner, Gérard Roussel. Two letters of Calvin to Francis Daniel belong to this date and place; and in them we find a changed note. One speaks of "the troublous times," and the other narrates two events: first, it describes a play "pungent with gall and vinegar," which the students had performed in the College of Navarre to satirise the Queen; and secondly, the action of certain factious

theologians who had prohibited Margaret's *Mirror of a Sinful Soul*. She had complained to the King, and he had intervened. The matter came before the University, and Nicolas Cop, the Rector, had spoken strongly against the arrogant doctors and in defence of the Queen, "mother of all the virtues and of all good learning." Le Clerc, a parish priest, the author of the mischief, defended his performance as a task to which he had been formally appointed, praising the King, the Queen as woman and as author, contrasting her book with "such an obscene production" as *Pantagruel*, and finally saying that the book had been published without the approval of the faculty and was set aside only as "liable to suspicion."

Two or three days later, on November 1, 1533, came the famous rectorial address which Calvin wrote, and Cop revised and delivered; and which shows how far the humanist had travelled since April 4, 1532, the date of the *De Clementia*. He is now alive to the religious question, though he has not carried it to its logical and practical conclusion. Two fresh influences have evidently come into his life, the New Testament of Erasmus and certain sermons by Luther. The exordium of the address reproduces, almost literally, some sentences from Erasmus' *Paraclesis*, including those which unfold his idea of the *philosophia Christiana*; while the body of it repeats Luther's exposition of the Beatitudes and his distinction between Law and Gospel, with the involved doctrines of Grace and Faith. Yet "*Ave gratia plena*" is retained in the exordium, and at the end the peacemakers are praised, who follow the example of Christ and contend not with the sword but with the word of truth.

This address enables us to seize Calvin in the very act and article of change; he has come under a double influence. Erasmus has compelled him to compare the ideal of Christ with the Church of his own day; and Luther has given him a notion of Grace which has convinced his reason and taken possession of his imagination. He has thus ceased to be a humanist and a Papist, but has not yet become a Reformer. And a Reformer was precisely what his conscience, his country, and his reason compelled him to become. Francis was flagrantly immoral, but a fanatic in religion; and mercy was not a virtue congenial to either Church or State. Calvin had seen the Protestants from within; he knew their honesty, their honour, the purity of their motives, and the integrity of their lives; and he judged, as a jurist would, that a man who had all the virtues of citizenship ought not to be oppressed and treated as unfit for civil office or even as a criminal by the State. This is no conjecture, for it is confirmed by the testimony he bears to the influence exercised over him by the martyred Étienne de la Forge. He thus saw that a changed mind meant a changed religion, and a changed religion a change of abode. Cop had to flee from Paris, and so had Calvin.

In the May of 1534 he went to Noyon, laid down his offices, was

imprisoned, liberated, and while there he seems to have finally renounced Catholicism. But he feared the forces of disorder which lurked in Protestantism, and which seemed embodied in the Anabaptists. Hence at Orleans he composed a treatise against one of their favourite beliefs, the sleep of the soul between death and judgment. Conscious personal being was in itself too precious, and in the sight of God too sacred, to be allowed to suffer even a temporary lapse. But to serve the cause he loved was impossible with the stake waiting for him, its fires scorching his face, and kindly friends endangered by his presence. And so in the winter of 1534 he retired from France and settled at Basel.

Aeneas Sylvius had once described Basel as a city which venerated images, but cared little for science, and had no wish to know letters; and when he became Pope he founded there a University which effected a more marvellous change than he could have anticipated. Erasmus chose Basel as his residence from 1514 to 1529; and here his New Testament and his editions of the great Latin Fathers were printed by John Froben, who joined to the soul of an artist the enterprise of a merchant. When Froben died Erasmus forsook Basel; but as the end drew near he came back, just as Calvin was finishing his *Institutio*, to die in the city which had been the scene of his most arduous and fruitful labours. And if the zeal for learning at Basel was strong, the zeal for religion was no less. As early as 1517 Capito had refused to celebrate the Mass, and had preached in the spirit of Luther. Here Œcolampadius had learned from humanism a sweet reasonableness that won the respect of Erasmus, yet ideas so radical that they placed him beside Zwingli at Marburg, and made him so preach against the images which the city used to venerate that the rabble hastened to insult and break them. Erasmus, who described the event in more than one letter, marvelled in his satirical way that "not a solitary Saint lifted a blessed finger" to work a protecting or retributory miracle that should stay or avenge the damage. Calvin did not reach the city which Œcolampadius had changed till three years after his death; but the Reformer found it guided by men who were just as congenial: Oswald Myconius, the chief pastor and preacher, who, even amid notable differences, continued ever a personal friend and admirer; Simon Grynaeus, a learned Grecian, with whom he then and later discussed, as he himself tells us, how best to study, to translate, and to interpret the Scriptures; Sebastian Munster, professor of Hebrew, just seeing through the press his *Biblia Hebraica*, praised in public as *Germanorum Esdras et Strabo*, and affectionately known in private as "the Rabbi," a master at whose feet Calvin could sit without shame; Thomas Platter, once a poor and vagrant scholar, then professor of Greek, but now a printer from whose press the *Institutio* was soon to issue, though owing to financial straits not so soon as its anxious author would have liked. Besides the residents, famous visitors came to Basel: from Zurich Henry Bullinger, who was there just at

this time, discussing the terms of the First Helvetic Confession, and twenty-one years later reminded Calvin of their meeting; and Conrad Pellican, who saw the dying Erasmus and heard great things of a certain John Calvin, a Frenchman who had dared to write plain and solid truth to the French King.

Now a city where Protestantism reigned, where learning flourished, and where men so unlike as Erasmus and Farel—the fervid preacher of Reform—could do their work unhindered, was certain to make a deep impression on a fugitive harassed and expatriated on account of religion; and the impression it made can be read in the *Christianae Religionis Institutio*, and especially in the prefatory Letter to Francis I. The *Institutio* is Calvin's positive interpretation of the Christian religion; the Letter is learned, eloquent, elegant, dignified, the address of a subject to his sovereign, yet of a subject who knows that his place in the State is as legal, though not as authoritative, as the sovereign's. It throbs with a noble indignation against injustice, and with a noble enthusiasm for freedom and truth. It is one of the great epistles of the world, a splendid apology for the oppressed and arraignment of the oppressors. It does not implore toleration as a concession, but claims freedom as a right. Its author is a young man of but twenty-six, yet he speaks with the gravity of age. He tells the King that his first duty is to be just; that to punish unheard is but to inflict violence and perpetrate fraud. Those for whom he speaks are, though simple and godly men, yet charged with crimes that, were they true, ought to condemn them to a thousand fires and gibbets. These charges the King is bound to investigate, for he is a minister of God, and if he fails to serve the God whose minister he is then he is a robber and no King. The lowliness of the men has as its counterpart the majesty of their beliefs, for the sake of which "*alii nostrum vinculis constringuntur, alii virgis caeduntur, alii in ludibrium circumducuntur, alii proscribuntur, alii saevissime torquentur, alii fuga elabuntur, omnes rerum angustia premimur, diris exsecrationibus devovemur, maledictis laceramur, indignissimis modis tractamur.*" Then he asks, "Who are our accusers?" and he turns on the priests like a new Erasmus, who does not, like the old, delight in satire for its own sake or in a literature which scourges men by holding up the mirror to vice; but who feels the sublimity of virtue so deeply that witticisms at the expense of vice are abhorrent to him. He takes up the charges in detail: it is said that the doctrine is new, doubtful, and uncertain, unconfirmed by miracles, opposed to the Fathers and ancient custom, schismatical and productive of schism, and that its fruits are sects, seditions, licence. On no point is he so emphatic as the repudiation of the personal charges: the people he pleads for have never raised their voice in faction or sought to subvert law and order; they fear God sincerely and worship Him in truth, praying even in exile for the royal person and House.

The book which this address to the King introduces is a sketch or programme of reform in religion. The first edition of the *Institutio* is distinguished from all later editions by the emphasis it lays, not on dogma, but on morals, on worship, and on polity. Calvin conceives the Gospel as a new law which ought to be embodied in a new life, individual and social. What came later to be known as Calvinism may be stated in an occasional sentence or implied in a paragraph, but it is not the substance or determinative idea of the book. The problem discussed has been set by the studies and the experience of the author; he has read the New Testament as a humanist learned in the law, and he has been startled by the contrast between its ideal and the reality which confronts him. And he proceeds in a thoroughly juridical fashion, just as Tertullian before him, and as Grotius and Selden after him. Without a document he can decide nothing; he needs a written law or actual custom; and his book falls into divisions which these suggest. Hence his first chapter is concerned with duty or conduct as prescribed by the Ten Commandments; his second with faith as contained in the Apostolic symbol; his third with prayer as fixed by the words of Christ; his fourth with the Sacrament as given in the Scriptures; his fifth with the false sacraments as defined by tradition and enforced by Catholic custom; and his sixth with Christian liberty or the relation of the ecclesiastical and civil authorities. But though the book is, as compared with what it became later, limited in scope and contents—the last edition which left the author's hand in 1559 had grown from a work in six chapters to one in four books and eighty chapters—yet its constructive power, its critical force, its large outlook impress the student. We have here none of Luther's scholasticism, or of Melanchthon's deft manipulation of incompatible elements; but we have the first thoughts on religion of a mind trained by ancient literature to the criticism of life.

In the second edition published in 1539 his old admirations reassert themselves. Plato is there described as of all philosophers "*religiosissimus et maxime sobrius*"; and Aristotle, Themistius, Cicero, Seneca, and other classical writers are quoted in a way that finds a parallel in no theological book of the period. But in this first edition he is too much in earnest, and writes too directly, to adorn his pages with classical references; though in his style, in his argument, in his deduction of all things from God, and in his correlation of our knowledge of God and of man, in his emphasis on morals, in his sense for conduct and love of freedom, the classical spirit is living and active. Thus, in his ideas of Christian liberty we can trace the student of Seneca, as in his appreciation of law and order we see the Roman jurist. He dislikes equally tyranny and licence. Liberty is said to consist in three things: freedom from the law as a means of acceptance with God, the spontaneous obedience of the justified to the Divine will, and freedom either to observe or neglect those external things which are in themselves indifferent. He specially insists on this

last; since without it there will be no end to superstition and the conscience will enter a long and inextricable labyrinth whence escape will be difficult. The Church is the elect people of God, and must, if it is to do its work in the world, obey Him. But it can obey only as it has control over its own destinies and authority over its own members. It will not err in matters of opinion if it is guided by the Holy Spirit and judges according to the Scriptures. Magistrates are ordained of God, and ought to be obeyed, even though wicked; but here a most significant exception is introduced. God is King of Kings; when He opens His mouth, He alone is to be heard; it were worse than foolish to seek to please men by offending Him. We are subject to our rulers, but only in Him; if they command what He has forbidden, we must fear God and disobey the King.

The *Institutio* bears the date "*Mense Martio; Anno* 1536"; but Calvin, without waiting till his book was on the market, made a hurried journey to Ferrara, whose Duchess, Renée, a daughter of Louis XII, stood in active sympathy with the Reformers. The reasons for this brief visit are very obscure; but it may have been undertaken in the hope of mitigating by the help of Renée the severity of the persecutions in France. On his return Calvin ventured, tradition says, to Noyon, probably for the sake of family affairs; but he certainly reached Paris; and, while in the second half of July making his way into Germany, he arrived at Geneva. An old friend, possibly Louis du Tillet, discovered him, and told Farel; and Farel, in sore straits for a helper, besought him, and indeed in the name of the Almighty commanded him, to stay. Calvin was reluctant, for he was reserved and shy, and conceived his vocation to be the scholar's rather than the preacher's; but the entreaties of Farel, half tearful, half minatory, prevailed. And thus Calvin's connexion with Geneva began.

With the ancient and medieval history of Geneva we have here no concern; it will be enough if we briefly indicate those peculiarities of its constitution which gave Calvin his opportunity, and so much of its history as will explain the condition in which he found it.

Ethnographically Geneva was connected with both the Teutonic and the Latin races; by language it was French, by religious interests and associations Italian, by political instincts and affinities Swiss, by commercial and industrial genius German. In the thirteenth century its civil superior had been a Count of Burgundy; in the fifteenth century and early sixteenth he had been long superseded by the Dukes of Savoy. And the supersession was inevitable, for Geneva occupied a corner of the Savoyard country; and, as an old chronicler has it, the bells of the city were heard by more Savoyards than citizens. Its constitution, at once hierarchical, feudal, and democratic, so balanced parties, whose interests were seldom compatible, as to put a premium on agitation and

intrigue. These parties were the Bishop, the Vicedom, or civil over-lord, and the citizens.

The Bishop was the sovereign of the city, elected originally by the clergy and laity jointly, later by the Cathedral Chapter, though customs significant of the older time continued to be observed. Thus the mere vote of the Chapter did not constitute the Bishop lord of the State; the election had further to be endorsed by the citizens, who accompanied the Bishop in solemn procession to the Cathedral, where before the altar and in the presence of clergy and people he swore on the open Missal that he would preserve their laws, their liberties, and their privileges. As sovereign he issued the coinage, imposed the customs, was general of the forces, and supreme judge in both civil and ecclesiastical causes. In criminal cases he exercised the prerogative of mercy, and endorsed or remitted penalties. The Cathedral Chapter formed his Council and represented him in his absence. It constituted a permanent aristocracy, and sat as a sort of spiritual peerage in the city Council. Certain castles and demesnes were assigned to the Bishop, in order that he might be as sovereign in appearance and in dignity as he was in law and in fact.

The Vicedom was captain of the Church, commissioned to repress violence in the city and to defend it from external attacks, to act in the less important civil and criminal cases, and to carry out the penalties which the law pronounced. He was not reckoned a citizen, and stood sponsor for all the foreigners who enjoyed the hospitality of Geneva. While in theory the Bishop's vassal, yet, as a matter of fact and for reasons which neither he nor the city was allowed to forget, the office had become hereditary in the House of Savoy; but as the Duke could not himself reside, his duties were discharged by two lieutenants, whose functions were carefully defined and delimited. In a word, the civil over-lord was the minister of his ecclesiastical superior; but the superior tended to become the puppet of the minister.

Apart from both stood the citizens in an order of their own. The general Council of the city, composed of the whole of the citizens, *i.e.* all the heads of families, met at the summons of the great bell twice each year to transact business affecting the community as such, to elect the four Syndics and the Treasurer, to conclude alliances, to proclaim laws, to fix the prices of wine and of grain. The Syndics represented the municipal independence as against the sovereignty of the Bishop and the power of the Vicedom. To them the greater criminal jurisdiction was entrusted, and they were responsible for good order within the city from sunset to sunrise. They were assisted by the Smaller Council, composed of twenty qualified citizens; and if any event too responsible for it to handle occurred, the Council of Sixty could be called, which was composed of the representatives of the several districts and the most experienced and respectable citizens. Later, and just before the

Reformation, the Council of Two Hundred was established in order that Geneva might be assimilated to the Swiss Cantons whose help it invoked.

A State so constituted and governed could hardly escape from the consciousness that it was a Church, or feel otherwise than as if the ecclesiastic at its head made its acts and legislation ecclesiastical. The spiritual offices were made secular without the secular offices becoming spiritual; in other words, the clergy were assimilated to the laity, while the laity did not correspond to the clerical ideal. The priests dressed and armed like the people, played and fought with them, behaved more like examples of worldliness than teachers of the Gospel; in a word, sinned and lived like citizens of Geneva. The decay of clerical morals was not peculiar to Geneva, though it must be noted as a main factor of the situation there. Kampschulte, here a reluctant witness, declares that the Bishop had become a humiliation to the Church and a degradation to the clergy; and he cites the case of the old priest who, when ordered to put away his mistress, replied that he was quite ready to obey, provided all his brethren were treated with the same severity. But the constitution acted on the collective even more subtly than on the personal consciousness. The Council legislated, disciplined, and excommunicated as if the State were a Church, or, what may be the same thing, as if there were no Church in the State. The extent to which a man could sin and yet remain a citizen was a matter of statutory regulation: no citizen was allowed to keep more than one mistress, and every convicted adulterer was banished. The prostitutes had a quarter where they dwelt, special clothing which they wore, and a "queen" who was responsible for the good order of her community. The clergy were a kind of moral police, responsible for the citizens and to the city; and so their deterioration meant a moral decline.

But a more obvious and, so far as our immediate point is concerned, a more serious consequence was this: every ecclesiastical question tended to become civil, and every civil question to become ecclesiastical. A constitution has a way of working in a fashion either better or worse than, considered *à priori*, would have seemed possible; and this because the people are ever a greater factor of harmony or disorder than the laws they live under. Hence, so long as Geneva was inspired by one spirit, the anomalies of the constitution did not breed discontent; but, when new energies and new ambitions awoke, these anomalies became fruitful of disaster to the State. So long as the Bishop and the people had common aims and interests, loyalty to both was easy; but, the moment the interests of the Bishop looked in an opposite direction from those of the people, the situation became difficult. For loyalty to the Bishop as head of the State meant loyalty to the Church of which he was head; but loyalty to the people as the chief constituent of the State became disloyalty to the Bishop as head both of Church and city. How this

situation arose in Geneva, what it signified and whither it tended subsequent events will show.

The determining factors of the situation were thus two, the Bishop and the Duke. The Bishop stood for an ideal which he was not always either able or willing to realise; the Duke, who was his vice-lord, stood for an interest whose strength grew with its years, and created the energy needed for its own realisation. The function of a Bishop's Vicar did not satisfy the House of Savoy; it wanted to be master in its own right, and sit in Geneva facing the ultramontane kingdoms, as it sat in Turin and faced the cismontane principalities and cities. And so began the game of intrigue in which the House has always been a skilled performer; and the Bishop was played off against the people, and the people against the Bishop. But it is harder to capture a whole city than a single person; it is easier to annex an exalted office than to control a whole population, a multitude of impulsive souls, singly accessible to incalculable yet imperious ideas. So the House concentrated itself on the Bishop; intrigued with the Chapter which elected, intrigued with Rome which approved; prevailed with both, and got its creatures appointed, men who would do its will and forget their office and its duties. A chronicler says that "Duke and Bishop, like Herod and Pilate, stood united against the city." The Bishop he means is the Bastard of Savoy, appointed 1513, a man of notoriously immoral conduct and in everything the unscrupulous instrument of the ducal policy. He lived ignobly, but served his House as best he could; and in a moment of remorse, on his death-bed in 1522, he admonished his successor Pierre de la Baume, thus: "Do not when thou art Bishop of Geneva walk in my footsteps, but defend the privileges of the Church and the freedom of the city." Pierre, of course, promised, and for a while remembered his promise, but soon forgot it, neglected Geneva, alienated its citizens, lived isolated among them, absented himself, and allowed the fruit to ripen which the House of Savoy hoped soon to pluck and eat.

This policy was attended with mixed results, some of which may be described as foreseen and desired by the ducal House; others as unforeseen and undesired, yet inevitable. We may reckon in the former class the weakening of the episcopal authority, the isolation of the Bishop, and his inability to stand alone, which meant his increased dependence on the strong arm of the Duke; and in the latter class the effect upon the people and the uprising of fit and fearless leaders. Geneva might abut upon Savoyard territory, but its citizens were not Savoyards, and did not intend to become what they were not. Around them was Swiss freedom, before them the French soil and spirit. They breathed the air, partook of the temper, lived by the help, of both; and they would be neither alienated from their kin nor cease to be masters of their own destinies. They were not dissatisfied with their Church nor with their

city or its laws; they knew what they owed to the Bishop, how defenceless they would have been without him, and what immunities his presence and influence had secured. But they would not because of past favours submit to present wrongs, especially to the wrong which the freeborn man most resents, the loss of his freedom. Hence, Geneva read the situation with other eyes than the House of Savoy, and resolved not to change its religion but to preserve its liberty.

Its leaders were men like Philibert Berthelier, a genuine Genevan, self-indulgent, not free from vice, but brave, prudent, patriotic, by his death helping to redeem the city he loved; Bezanson Hugues, a statesman, pure and high-minded, incapable of meanness or cowardice, a devout Catholic, yet a strenuous republican, whose policy was to check the Savoyard by a Swiss confederacy or a joint citizenship with Swiss allies; François de Bonivard, Abbot of St Victor, a humanist with the gift of speech and of letters, a kind of provincial Erasmus, with a graphic pen and a faculty for witty epigram, yet with a courage that neither the fear nor the experience of a prison could damp. The patriots were known as "*Eyguenots*," confederates, men who had bound themselves by an oath to stand together and serve the common cause; the Savoyard party were termed "Mamelukes" because, as Bonivard tells us, "they surrendered freedom and the public weal that they might submit to tyranny, as the Mamelukes denied Christ that they might follow Mohammad."

The battle was fought with splendid tenacity; the patriots, as became loyal Catholics, first tried to coerce the Bishop by appeals to Rome and Vienne, and failed. Left face to face with Savoy, they appealed to their Swiss neighbours, Bern and Freiburg, proposed to them a joint citizenship, and long negotiated concerning it in vain. Bern hung back; for, progressive and Protestant, it did not desire that the defeat of the Duke should be to the advantage of the Bishop, who at last himself took the decisive step. On August 20, 1530, Pierre de la Baume proclaimed the Genevans rebels, and called upon the Savoyard host to put down the rebellion. Bern and Freiburg took the field, and the emancipation of Geneva began. Yet it was only a beginning; the ecclesiastical question was involved in the political, though the political had till now concealed the religious. But the revolt against the Bishop could not but become a revolt against the Church. In other times it might have been the reverse, but not now. Reform was in the air; the preachers had long stormed at the gates of the city, and they had remained closed. But with Bern helping in the front they could be kept fast no longer. They were opened, and Guillaume Farel, fiery and eloquent in speech and indomitable in spirit, preached in his fearless way. On February 8, 1534, the public opinion of Geneva pronounced for the Bernese joint citizenship, and therefore for the Reformation; and thus ended the reign of the Bishop and the chances of the House

of Savoy. On May 21, 1536, the citizens of Geneva swore that they would live according to the holy Evangelical law and word of God; and two months later Calvin's connexion with the city began.

Calvin's life from this point onwards falls into three parts: his first stay in Geneva from July, 1536, to March, 1538; his residence in Strassburg from September, 1538, to September, 1541; and his second stay in Geneva from the last date till his death, May 27, 1564. In the first period, he, in company with Farel, made an attempt to organise the Church, and reform the mind and manners of Geneva, and failed; his exile, formally voted by the Council, was the penalty of his failure. In the second period he was professor of theology and French preacher at Strassburg, a trusted divine and adviser, a delegate to the Protestant Churches of Germany, which he learned to know better, making the acquaintance of Melanchthon, and becoming more appreciative of Luther. At Strassburg some of his best literary work was done—his *Letter to Cardinal Sadoleto* (in its way his most perfect production), his *Commentary on the Romans*, a *Treatise on the Lord's Supper*, the second Latin and the first French edition of his *Institutio*. In the third period he introduced and completed his legislation at Geneva, taught, preached, and published there, watched the Churches everywhere, and conducted the most extensive correspondence of his day. In these twenty-eight years he did a work which changed the face of Christendom.

It has been a subject of perhaps equal reproach among his enemies and praise by his friends that, as Beza says, Calvin "in doctrine made scarcely any change." For a young man at twenty-six to reach his final conclusions in the realms of thought and belief, especially after a radical revolution of mind, would be matter of congratulation for his enemies rather than for his admirers. But the judgment rests on a double mistake, biographical and historical. As a matter of fact, few men may have changed less; but few also have developed more. Every crisis in his career taught him something, and so enhanced his capacity. His studies of Stoicism showed him the value of morals; and he learned how to emphasise the sterner ethical qualities as well as the humaner, and the more clement by the side of the higher, public virtues. His early humanism made him a scholar and an exegete, a master of elegant Latinity, of lucid and incisive speech, of a graphic pen and historical imagination. His juristic studies gave him an idea of law, through which he interpreted the more abstract notions of theology, and a love of order, which compelled him to organise his Church. His imagination, playing upon the primitive Christian literature, helped him to see the religion Jesus instituted as Jesus Himself saw it; while the forces visible around him—the superstitions, the regnant and unreproved vices, the people so quickly sinning and so easily forgiven, the relics so innumerable and so fictitious, the acts and articles of worship, and especially the Sacraments deified and

urned into substitutes for Deity—induced him to judge the system that laimed to be the sole interpreter and representative of Christ as a crafty ompound of falsehood and truth.

His knowledge that the system had profited by men like Erasmus, rhose wit made havoc of clerical sins and monkish superstition and Romish errors, and who yet conformed, or men like Gerard Roussel, who preached what he himself and they thought the Gospel, and who yet consented to hold office in the Catholic Church,—begat in him the belief that nly by separation and negation could Reformation be accomplished. His riendship with the good and simple, those who had tried to realise the eligion of Jesus, and his knowledge of the tyrannies, the miseries, and he martyrdoms which they had in consequence endured, persuaded him hat his duty as an honest man was to side with the oppressed whom he dmired against the oppressors whose ways and policy he detested. His xperiences as a teacher and preacher of the new faith, especially at Geneva, where he tells us he found at his first coming preachings and umults, breaking and burning of images, but no Reformation, showed im that individual men and even a whole society might profess the Reformed faith without being reformed in character. Out of these xperiences came his master problem, namely, by what means could we best ecure the expression of a changed faith in a changed life? Or, in other ords, how could the Church be made not simply an institution for the orship of God, but an agency for the making of men fit to worship Him?

His attempt to solve this problem constitutes his chief title to a lace in the history of religion and civilisation. It means that Calvin as greater as a legislator than as a theologian, that we have less cause › be grateful to him for the system called Calvinism than for the hurch that he organised. In other words, his polity is a more perfect xpression of the man than his theology, though his theology was the oint where he was most vulnerable, and where therefore he was most ercely, not to say ferociously, attacked. The foes born in his own ousehold, men like Castellio or Bolsec, took the Divine decrees as the ›ot where they could strike most fatally at him and his preeminence. The Jesuits developed their doctrine in explicit antithesis to his; and ie Lutherans, when they wished to discredit his views on the Lord's upper, thought they could do it most effectually by criticising the bsolute Predestination. The sects that rose within the Reformed hurch, such as the Socinian and the Remonstrant, justified their schism a protest against views which they described as equally dishonouring God and belittling to man. But though Calvin's theology occasioned e hottest and bitterest controversies known to Christian history, yet it here that his mind is least original and his ideas are most clearly rivative. Without Augustine we should never have had Calvinism, iich is but the principles of the anti-Pelagian treatises developed, stematised, and applied.

There are indeed two points of difference between them; Augustine disguised his positions in a criticism of hated and feared sectaries; but Calvin stated his in their severe and colossal nakedness as the sole truth which Scripture had revealed to men. Yet Augustine affirms and argues his doctrines with a breadth and a positive harshness which we do not find in Calvin; on the contrary, there is evidence that while the system held and awed Calvin's reason it yet did not win his heart. That it was taught by the greatest Father of the Church was a reason that appealed to him as a scholar; that this Father found it in Paul was a more cogent reason still, for thus it appealed to him as a thinker whose ultimate authority was the Word of God. And on this point we have incidental evidence. In August, 1539, Calvin wrote the Preface to the second edition of his *Institutio*, where the doctrines of Grace and Sin occupy for the first time their determinative position in his system; and in October of the same year he published his *Commentary on Romans*. It seems, therefore, as if the greater prominence that he now gave to the doctrines, which we have come to think most characteristic of him, was due to his closer study of Paul as interpreted by Augustine. And this system helped him to do two things: to explain his own as a normal human experience, and to face undismayed the strength and the terrors of an infallible Church. These two positions are affirmed and co-ordinated in a splendid passage in the *Letter to Sadoleto*, published also in 1539, in September, just between the *Institutio* and the *Commentary*, which tells of his vocation by God, and of his consequent right to speak in the name of Him who had put His word in his mouth and written His law upon his conscience. God had called him, and laid upon him a duty which he could not evade without defying God.

But here emerges another point of distinction from Augustine: Calvin conceived that God spoke to him directly, without any intermediate person or institution. Augustine's theology was absolute, but his theory of the Church was conditional, and thus the one qualified the other: the God whom the thinker conceived was modified by the God of whom the priest was the representative and mouthpiece. It is the essence of the priestly idea to manipulate and administer the conditions on which God finds access to men, and men gain access to God. Hence, so long as Augustine's theology was embedded in a sacerdotal system, the system softened the theology; the thought was accommodated to the institution, the institution was not subdued to the likeness of the thought. But Calvin rejected the Church of Augustine, and took over his later intellectual system in all its naked severity. The sin of man confronted the grace of God; man, sinful by nature, could do no right: God, infinite in majesty and in holiness, could do no wrong. Man was born in sin; his nature was corrupt, and as his nature was his actions must be. If then he was to be saved, God must save him; and, as God's will was gracious, saving was as natural to Him as sinning was to man.

Hence, we could contribute nothing towards our own salvation; God did it all; we had no merit, and He had all the glory. In a system so conceived there was no room for the priest; his prayers and sacrifices, his masses and absolutions, his shrines and relics and articles of worship, were but the impertinences of ephemeral and feeble man in the face of the Eternal Potency.

Calvin knew well the sublimity of the system which he expounded, but he could have wished it to be more pitiful. He did not love to think of the innumerable millions of the heathen with their infant children ordained to everlasting death; the decree that fixed the number alike of the saved and the lost was to him an awful decree, but he could not look towards the Alps without feeling how closely the sublime and the awful were allied. And if the sublimity of earth was terrible, how much more terrible must be the majesty of God! But if He is so august, must we not labour to attain the dignity of moral manhood, the only dignity which it becomes Him to recognise?

We come then to Calvin's legislative achievements as his main title to name and fame. But two points must here be noted. In the first place, while his theology was less original and effective than his legislation or polity, yet he so construed the former as to make the latter its logical and indeed inevitable outcome. The polity was a deduction from the theology, which may be defined as a science of the Divine will as a moral will, aiming at the complete moralisation of Man, whether as a unit or as a society. The two were thus so organically connected that each lent strength to the other, the system to the Church and the Church to the system, while other and more potently reasonable theologies either died or lived a feeble and struggling life. Secondly, the legislation was made possible and practicable by Geneva, probably the only place in Europe where it could have been enacted and enforced. We have learned enough concerning Genevan history and institutions to understand why this should have been the case. The city was small, free, homogeneous, distinguished by a strong local patriotism, a stalwart communal life. In obedience to these instincts it had just emancipated itself from the ecclesiastical Prince and its ancient religious system; and the change thus accomplished was, though disguised in a religious habit, yet essentially political. For the Council which abolished the Bishop had made itself heir to his faculties and functions; it could only dismiss him as civil lord by dismissing him as the ecclesiastical head of Geneva, and in so doing it assumed the right to succeed as well as to supersede him in both capacities. This, however, involved a notable inversion of old ideas; before the change the ecclesiastical authority had been civil, but because of the change the civil authority became ecclesiastical. If theocracy means the rule of the Church or the sovereignty of the clergy in the State, then the ancient constitution of Geneva was theocratic; if democracy means the sovereignty of the people in Church as well as in

State, then the change had made it democratic. And it was just afte the change had been effected that Calvin's connexion with the cit began.

Its chief pastor had persuaded him to stay as a colleague, and th Council appointed him professor and preacher. He was young, exactl twenty-seven years of age, full of high ideals, but inexperienced, un acquainted with men, without any knowledge of Geneva and the stat of things there. He could therefore make no terms, could only sta to do his duty. What that duty was soon became apparent. Genev had not become any more moral in character because it had change its mind in religion. It had two months before Calvin's arrival swor to live according to the holy evangelical law and Word of God; bu it did not seem to understand its own oath. And the man whom h intellectual sincerity and moral integrity had driven out of Catholicism could not hold office in any Church which made light of conviction an conduct; and so he at once set himself to organise a Church that shoul be efficaciously moral. He built on the ancient Genevan idea, that th city is a Church; only he wished to make the Church to be primary an real. The theocracy, which had been construed as the reign of the clerg he would interpret as ideal and realise as a reign of God. The citizen who had assumed control of their own spiritual destinies and ecclesiastic affairs, he wanted to instruct in their responsibilities and discipline int obedience. And he would do it in the way of a jurist who believes i the harmony of law and custom; he would by positive enactments trai the city, which conceived itself to be a Church, to be and behave as it were indeed a Church, living according to the Gospel which it ha sworn to obey.

Thus a confession of faith was drawn up which the people wer to adopt as their own, and so attain clarity and concordance of min concerning God and His Word; and a catechism was composed whic was to be made the basis of religious instruction in both the school an the family, for the citizen as well as the child. Worship was to b carefully regulated, psalm-books prepared, psalm-singing cultivatec the preacher was to interpret the Word, and the pastor to supervi the flock. The Lord's Supper was to be celebrated monthly, but onl those who were morally fit or worthy were to be allowed to communicat The Church, in order that it might fulfil its functions and guard the Hol Table, must have the right of excommunication. It was not enough tha a man should be a citizen or a councillor to be admitted to the Lord Supper; his mind must be Christian, and his conduct Christ-lik Without faith the rite was profaned, the presence of Christ was no realised. Moreover, since matrimonial cases were many and infelicit sprang both from differences of faith and impurity of conduct, a boarc composed partly of magistrates and partly of ministers, was to b appointed to deal with them; and it was to have the power to exclud

from the Church those who either did not believe its doctrines or did not obey its commandments.

These were drastic proposals to be made to a city which had just dismissed its Bishop, attained political freedom, and proclaimed a Reformation of religion; and Calvin was not the man to leave them inoperative. A card-player was pilloried; a tire-woman, a mother, and two bridesmaids were arrested because they had adorned the bride too gaily; an adulterer was driven with the partner of his guilt through the streets by the common hangman, and then banished. These things taxed the temper of the city sorely; it was not unfamiliar with legislation of the kind, but it had not been accustomed to see it enforced. Hence, men who came to be known as "libertines," though they were both patriotic and moral and only craved freedom, rose and said, "This is an intolerable tyranny; we will not allow any man to be lord over our consciences." And about the same time Calvin's orthodoxy was challenged. Two Anabaptists arrived and demanded liberty to prophesy; and Peter Caroli charged him with heresy as to the Trinity. He would not use the Athanasian Creed; and he defended himself by reasons that the scholar who knows its history will respect. The end soon came. When he heard that he had been sentenced to banishment, he said, "If I had served men this would have been a poor reward, but I have served Him who never fails to perform what He has promised."

In 1541 Geneva recalled Calvin, and he obeyed as one who goes to fulfil an imperative but unwelcome duty. There is nothing more pathetic in the literature of the period than his hesitancies and fears. He tells Farel that he would rather die a hundred times than again take up that cross "*in qua millies quotidie pereundum esset.*" And he writes to Viret that it were better to perish once for all than "*in illa carnificina iterum torqueri.*" But he loved Geneva, and it was in evil case. Rome was plotting to reclaim it; Savoy was watching her opportunity, the patriots feared to go forward, and even the timid dared not go back. So the necessities of the city, divided between its factions and its foes, constituted an appeal which Calvin could not resist; but he did not yield unconditionally. He went back as the legislator who was to frame laws for its Church; and he so adapted them to the civil constitution and the constitution to them, that he raised the little city of Geneva to be the Protestant Rome.

Calvin's idea, whether of the Church or the State, it is neither possible nor necessary to discuss fully here; as he conceived, Fatherhood belonged to God, motherhood to the Church: we entered into life by being conceived in her womb and suckled at her breasts, and so long as we lived we were as scholars in her school. She was catholic, holy, one and indivisible; to invent another Church would be to divide Christ. In this sense she comprehended all the people of God, His elect in every

age and place; but this eternal and internal Church was, as it were, distributed into local and external Churches, which existed in the towns and villages inhabited of men. Calvin held, indeed, that the local ought to possess the same spiritual qualities as the universal Church; but he did not hold the two to be identical. They differed in many ways; in the one case the chosen of God constituted the Church, but in the other case, as Augustine had said, "there are very many sheep without, and very many wolves within." The universal Church lived under the immediate sovereignty of God; but particular Churches, while bound so to live, yet were organised according to the wants of human society, and so long as the people were God's and lived unto Him, their society was a Church, which, as an inhabitant of space and time, could not but live its corporate life in some State, in relation to it even while differing from it. What this relation ought to be Calvin rather implied than discussed. He assumed their distinctness, but his policy often involved their identity. It would be approximately true to say that the ideal Church was independent of the State, above it while distributed through it; but the actual Church, while owing its existence to the ideal, was yet associated with the State, and often bound to act with it and through it. It was not possible that a local Church should be merged in the State, for then it would cease to be a Divine institution; or be subordinate to the State, for then it would be a mere minister of man's will, subject to all the accidents and influences proper to time; or be separated from the State, for then it would be cut off from the field which most needed its presence and action.

Hence the proper analogy was natural rather than political:—as soul and body constituted one man, so Church and State constituted one society, distinct in function but inseparable in being. Without the State there would be no medium for the Church to work in, no body for the soul to animate; without the Church there would be no law higher than expediency to govern the State, no ideal of thought and conduct, no soul to animate the body. Both Church and State therefore were necessary to the good ordering of society, and each was explained by the same idea. All human authority was the creation of God; His will had formed the State to care for the actual man, who was temporal, and the Church to care for the ideal man, who was immortal. Each had the same cause or root; and, without both, life could not be so ordered as to realise Eternal Will. Over the State God placed the magistrate, who might here be a monarch, an Emperor or King, and there a Syndic or Council, created by the people for the people; but whatever he might be, he was yet a power ordained of God for the good of man and the regulation of society. In, rather than over, the Church God had set a ministry or authorities that were to rule by the teaching which convinced the reason and commanded the conscience, and by the service which won the heart and persuaded the will. The ministers were

responsible to the State in all civil matters; but the magistrates were responsible to the Church in all religious concerns, especially those affecting faith and conduct. The laws of the State were civil in form, but religious in origin; the laws of the Church were civil in sanction, though spiritual in scope and purpose. Calvin indeed had, as regards civil polity, distinguished between monarchy, aristocracy, and democracy, and had indicated their respective excellences and defects, as well as his own personal preferences; but he declined to assert that one of them was absolutely or under all conditions the best. He could not feel as if a similar latitude of judgment were allowed him as regards the Church, where man was not free to follow any order he liked, for in the New Testament a polity was given him to imitate. Our Lord had Himself shown how His Church ought to be governed, and where He had spoken man's duty was to interpret His word and do His will.

The *Ordonnances Ecclésiastiques* may be described as Calvin's programme of Genevan reform, or his method for applying to the local and external Church the government which our Lord had instituted and the Apostles had realised. These Ordinances expressed his historical sense and gratified his religious temper, while adapting the Church to the city, so that the city might become a better Church. To explain in detail how he proposed to do this is impossible within our limits; and we shall therefore confine ourselves to the most important of the factors he created, the Ministry and the Consistory.

The Reformed ministry had till now been largely the creation of conversion, or inspiration, or chance, and the result could not be termed satisfactory. Convinced men had found their way into it, and had created a conviction as sincere and an enthusiasm as vehement as their own; but along with them had also come hosts of restless men, moved by superficial and often ignoble causes:—discontent, petulance, discomfort, the desire to legitimise illegitimate connexions, dislike to authority, and the mere love of change. And they had proved most mischievous forces in the Protestant Churches, had continued restless, become seditious, impracticable, schismatic, authors of disorder and enemies of peace, who arrested progress and made men ashamed of change. Calvin had had his own experience of these men; and he, as a man of grave and juristic mind, had found the experience disagreeable, and was to find it more disagreeable still. With the insight of genius he perceived that the battle could be won, not by chance recruits, but only by a disciplined army; and, in order that the army might be created, he invented the discipline. The Ordinances may indeed be termed a method for making and guiding a Reformed ministry, a clergy that, without any priestly character, should yet be more efficient than the ancient priesthood. Hence where the Roman placed the Church, Calvin set the Deity, and made a man's right to enter the ministerial office depend on his vocation

by God. But this belief in a Divine choice and call was to be tested by a threefold process, Examination, Election, Institution or Introduction. The Examination, which was to be conducted by men already in the ministry, the recognised preachers and teachers of the Church, covered the whole period of thought and life; what the candidate had learned at school and college, what he had been at home and in society, what evidence he could furnish as to his call being of God. He had to show what and why he believed; the relation in which his beliefs stood to the Church on the one hand and the Scriptures on the other; whether he could teach what he had learned, or preach as he believed; how he had hitherto lived, and whether he had so behaved himself as to be without reproach. If the candidate satisfied the ministerial examiners, they presented him to the Council; if the Council approved, he preached before the people; and if they approved, he was declared to be elected a minister of the Word. Institution, which was as much a civil as a religious process, followed, and it ended with the candidate taking an oath before the Council that he would edify the Church, serve the city, and set to all a goodly example of obedience.

But these initial steps were not the most essential parts of the discipline; more effectual still were the means employed to secure the minister's efficiency, and to define his relation to the city or Church. The conduct of each person was the concern of the ministerial body as a whole; and the behaviour of the body was open to the criticism of every minister. The humblest pastor had the right, which was laid upon him as a duty, to criticise the bearing or the action of the most eminent; and responsibility was so personal and yet so collective, at once so concentrated and so distributed, that while it belonged to all, each individual was made to feel as if he alone bore it. Thus in Geneva the ministers formed the Venerable Company, correspondent to the Smaller Council, which was, as it were, the cabinet or executive of the Greater; and every week it met in Congregation, as it was called, to study the Scriptures, discuss doctrine, and review conduct. There was, besides, every three months a special Synod which made inquisition into the faults and failures of the brotherhood, and was charged with the discipline of the faithless. Alongside of these faculties ran duties which were coextensive with the religious wants of the city. The minister of the Word was a preacher who had to speak to the people concerning the truth and will of God; a pastor of the flock which was given him to supervise and tend; a guide of the worship which he was bound to make worthy of God and uplifting to man; an administrator of the Sacraments which sealed the covenants and spoke to faith of God's saving grace and the presence of His Son; an instructor with the duty of catechising old and young and directing education; a friend to every man who needed him, with a special mission to the poor, especially in seasons of disease and distress, while also the soul of all the charity in the city.

Nor, though the ministers were to hold so influential a place in the body politic, could they come to feel as if they were a self-propagating, an exclusive, or a sacrosanct corporation. Without the ministry the minister could not be made; but without the people he could not be called or maintained. He issued from the ranks of the citizens, and he could be reduced to their condition again. If his conduct was scandalous, or if his faith changed or failed, the reduction was inevitable. He was responsible to the Church, typified by its clergy; and responsible for the Church, typified by the city or the laity. Calvin's theory was a theocracy, not a hierocracy; the clergy did not reign, nor did the organised Church govern; but God reigned over Church and State alike, and so governed that both magistrates and clergy were His ministers. In Geneva every office was sacred, and existed for the glory of the God who was its Creator.

The ministerial ideal embodied in these Ecclesiastical Ordinances may be said to have had certain indirect but international results; it compelled Calvin to develop his system of education, it supplied the Reformed Church, especially in France, with the men which it needed to fight its battles and to form the iron in its blood; it presented the Reformed Church everywhere with an intellectual and educational ideal which must be realised if its work was to be done; and it created the modern preacher, defining the sphere of his activity and setting up for his imitation a noble and lofty example.

Calvin soon found that the Reformed faith could live in a democratic city only by an enlightened pulpit speaking to enlightened citizens, and that an educated ministry was helpless without an educated people. His method for creating both entitles him to rank among the foremost makers of modern education. As a humanist he believed in the classical languages and literatures—there is a tradition which says that he read through Cicero once a year—and so "he built his system on the solid rock of Græco-Roman antiquity." Yet he did not neglect religion; he so trained the boys of Geneva through his Catechism that each was said to be able to give a reason for his faith "like a doctor of the Sorbonne." He believed in the unity of knowledge and the community of learning, placing the magistrate and the minister, the citizen and the pastor, in the hands of the same teacher, and binding the school and the university together. The boy learned in the one and the man studied in the other; but the school was the way to the university, the university was the goal of the school. In nothing does the pædagogic genius of Calvin more appear than in his fine jealousy as to the character and competence whether of masters or professors, and in his unwearied quest after qualified men. His letters teem with references to the men in various lands and many universities whom he was seeking to bring to Geneva. The first Rector, Antoine Saunier, was a notable man; and he never rested till he had secured his dear old teacher, Mathurin Cordier.

Castellio was a schoolmaster; Theodore Beza was head of College and Academy, or school and university, together; and Calvin himself was a professor of theology. The success of the College was great; the success of the Academy was greater. Men came from all quarters—English, Italians, Spanish, Germans, Russians, ministers, jurists, old men, young men, all with the passion to learn in their blood—to jostle each other among the thousand hearers who met to listen to the great Reformer. But France was the main feeder of the Academy; Frenchmen filled its chairs, occupied its benches, learned in it the courage to live and the will to die. From Geneva books poured into France; and the French Church was ever appealing for ministers, yet never appealed in vain. Within eleven years, 1555–66—Calvin died in 1564—it is known that Geneva sent 161 pastors into France; how many more may have gone, unrecorded, we cannot tell. And they were learned men, strenuous, fearless, praised by a French Bishop as modest, grave, saintly, with the name of Jesus Christ ever on their lips. Charles IX implored the magistrates of Geneva to stop the supply and withdraw the men already sent; but the magistrates replied that the preachers had been sent not by them but by their ministers, who believed that the sovereign duty of all Princes and Kings was to do homage to Him who had given to them their dominion. It was small wonder that the Venetian Suriano should describe Geneva as "the mine whence came the ore of heresy"; or that the Protestants should gather courage as they heard the men from Geneva sing psalms in the face of torture and death.

It was indeed a very different France which the eyes of the dying Calvin saw from that which the young man had seen thirty years before. Religious hate was even more bitter and vindictive; war had come and made persecution more ferocious; but the Huguenots had grown numerous, potent, respected, feared, and disputed with Catholicism the supremacy of the kingdom. And Calvin had done it, not by arms nor by threats, nor by encouragement of sedition or insurrection—to such action he was ever resolutely opposed—but by the agency of the men whom he formed in Geneva, and by their persuasive speech. The Reformed minister was essentially a preacher, intellectual, exegetical, argumentative, seriously concerned with the subjects that most appealed to the serious-minded. Modern oratory may be said to begin with him, and indeed to be his creation. He helped to make the vernacular tongues of Western Europe literary. He accustomed the people to hear the gravest and most sacred themes discussed in the language which they knew; and the themes ennobled the language, the language was never allowed to degrade the themes. And there was no tongue and no people that he influenced more than the French. Calvin made Bossuet and Massillon possible; as a preacher he found his successor in Bourdaloue; and a literary critic who does not love him has expressed a doubt as to whether Pascal could be more eloquent or was so profound. And the ideal then realised in

eva exercised an influence far beyond France. It extended into land, which in the strength of the Reformed faith resisted Charles V his son, achieved independence, and created the freest and best cated State on the continent of Europe. John Knox breathed for ile the atmosphere of Geneva, was subdued into the likeness of the 1 who had made it, and when he went home he copied its education tried to repeat its Reformation. English Reformers, fleeing from tyrdom, found a refuge within its hospitable walls, and, returning to gland, attempted to establish the Genevan discipline, and failed, but eeded in forming the Puritan character. If the author of the *'onnances Ecclésiastiques* accomplished, whether directly or indirectly, much, we need not hesitate to term him a notable friend to isation.

The Consistory may be described as Calvin's method for moralising ugh the Church the life of man and the State to which he belonged. may in the manner of the jurist have imagined that regulation by tive law was the most efficient means of governing conduct; but if egislated as a jurist, he thought and purposed as a Reformer. It is , where injustice is easiest, that we ought to be most scrupulously . Calvin was resolved, so far as he had power, to make the Church t it had not been but what it ought to be, an institution organised the creation of a moral mankind. For this reason he claimed for it right of excommunication and the power to excommunicate. But e conceived the matter, the exercise of the power which followed 1 the possession of the right, while spiritual in essence and in purpose, ht yet be civil in certain of its effects. The Consistory was a body ointed to be the guardian of morals, and therefore possessed of the er to excommunicate.

It was composed of six ministers and twelve elders. The elders to be elected annually, and were to be men of good and honour- conduct, blameless and free from suspicion, animated by the fear God and endowed with spiritual wisdom. They were to be chosen, from the Smaller Council, four from the Council of Sixty, and six 1 the Great Council; they were to be elected at the same time as magistrates, were to be capable of re-election, and were to take oath of allegiance to the State and fidelity to the Church. They esented the idea that Geneva was a Church-State; and their es were to have their eyes upon every man, family, or district, to their ears open to every complaint, to punish every offence according carefully-graduated scale, and to enforce purity everywhere. The istory's jurisdiction was not civil, but spiritual; the sword which it led was not Caesar's but Christ's, yet it had rights of entry and tigation that were not so much Christ's as Caesar's. It was a judicial and sat every Thursday to examine charges of misconduct or

immorality, to pass sentences from which there was no appeal, and where necessary to hand the guilty over to the magistrates to be punished according to law. If any offender refused to appear, a civil officer was sent to bring him; and so every ecclesiastical offence became an act of civil disobedience. Thus, obstinate refusal to communicate was regarded as a punishable crime; so were frivolous or continued absence from church, disrespect to parents, blasphemy, and adultery. One young woman who sang profane songs was banished, and another who sang them to psalm-tunes was scourged. Heresy became as much an offence as immorality. If a creed or confession becomes a law of the State as well as of the Church, to speak or agitate against it becomes treason. In other words, if opinion is established by law, heresy is turned into crime. And this Geneva soon discovered. Castellio's doubts as to the canonicity of Solomon's Song, and as to the received interpretation of Christ's descent into Hades, Bolsec's criticism of predestination, Gruet's suspected scepticism and possession of infidel books, Servetus' rationalism and anti-Trinitarian creed, were all opinions judged to be criminal. Infallibility is not the only system that makes heresy culpable and the heretic guilty. If the Church will be a State, and enforce its laws, which must affect both conduct and belief, by the only method a State can follow, then it must bear the reproach of being more cruel, and therefore more unjust, than any purely civil power. The heretic may be a man of irreproachable character; but if heresy be treason against the law, a character without reproach may aggravate rather than extenuate the crime. The man of imperfect morals may be too feeble of will to differ in opinion from the constituted authority, and his intellectual conformity may save him from the sentence which his moral weakness deserves. And time alone was needed to make it obvious how imperfectly Geneva could attain either unity of faith or purity of life by turning her Church into a city governed by positive law.

Many points remain of necessity undiscussed. The merits and defects of Calvin as a writer of polemical treatises; his work as a statesman, and his appreciation of political questions in lands so unlike his own as England, his qualities as a correspondent who feels no affairs of State too large to grapple with, and no personal concern too small to touch; his worth and wisdom as an adviser who loves the great of the earth for the good they can do, and judges that the higher a person is placed the more need there is for plain and candid speech, but who forgets not the humble and the poor, and can pause amid the mightiest concerns to hear their plaints; his attachment and tenderness as a friend, whether in his brilliant youth or his sadder age, when he loved to unbosom himself to his strenuous comrade Guillaume Farel, or his devoted companion Pierre Viret—could have justice done them only were the limits of our space wholly different from what they are.

But there are three things that may be emphasised in conclusion. The

first is Calvin's irenical services to Protestantism. He made the Reformed Church less antithetical to the Lutheran, and the Lutheran leaders better understood among the Reformed. His doctrine of the Lord's Supper may be described as a spiritual doctrine of the Real Presence; he escaped the miserable perplexities which lurked in the scholastic notion of *Substantia*, and were used to justify Transubstantiation on the one hand, and Consubstantiation on the other. Where faith was, there the Lord was, and where it was not there could be no idea of Him, and no image or symbol could speak of His presence. Secondly, mention must be made of Calvin's services to the French tongue. He perhaps more than any other man made it a literary vehicle, a medium for high philosophical and religious discussion. The *Institutio* has been said to be the first book written in French which can be described as logically composed, built up according to a consecutive and proportioned plan. The style is the man, exact, sober, precise, restrained; sad perhaps, or a trifle cold, but full of conviction and reason. The French he speaks is a natural product, an evolution and a new phase of the medieval French, refreshed, vivified, made simpler and more living by baptism in its original source, classical Latinity. Thirdly, his services to the cause of sacred learning must not be forgotten. These it is hardly possible to exaggerate, he is the sanest of commentators, the most skilled of exegetes, the most reasonable of critics. He knows how to use an age to interpret a man, a man to interpret an age. His exegesis is never forced or fantastic; he is less rash and subjective in his judgments than Luther, more reverent to Scripture, more faithful to history, more modern in spirit. His work on the Psalms has much to make our most advanced scholars ashamed of the small progress we have made either in method or in conclusions. And his work is inspired by a noble belief; he thought that the one way to realise Christianity was by knowing the mind of Christ; that this mind was expressed in the Scriptures; and that to make them living and credible was to make indefinitely more possible its incorporation in the thoughts and institutions of man. It is by his service to this cause that Calvin must be ultimately judged.

CHAPTER XII.

THE CATHOLIC SOUTH.

The great wave of revolution and reconstruction which was passin over northern Europe in the earlier half of the sixteenth century did no leave the south untouched. Though the first actual outbreak occurre beyond the Alps, the feeling to which it gave expression was not merel Teutonic. Many of the causes which led up to it were common to al Western Christendom; some, as for instance the demand for liberty o opinion and free enquiry, were even more characteristic of Italy tha of Germany. Accordingly, vigorous attempts arose in many parts o southern Europe to bring about a reformation in the Church—attempt which were by no means a mere echo of the changes in the north. Bu they never obtained a really strong hold upon the affections of th common people, and never secured the friendship, or even the neutrality of the civil power; and so, both in Italy and in the Iberian peninsula their suppression was only a question of time. By the year 1576, whe the charges against Bartolomé Carranza were finally adjudicated upon they were practically at an end. Isolated cases of heresy still occurred but there was no longer anything like an organised revolt against th doctrinal or disciplinary system of the Papacy.

In tracing the course of the Reform movements of southern Europ we are dealing with forces which became more widely divergent as tim went on. Men at first acted together who ultimately found themselve violently opposed to one another; principles were adduced on the sam side which proved in time to be sharply contrasted. The old-standin desire to curb the power of the Curia and to vindicate the authority o General Councils over the whole Church joined hands in the earlier stage of the movement with the wider, yet more individualistic, aspirations o the Renaissance. Men who had come under the influence of the new spiri in any of its manifestations were able to work together at first, whethe they strove to reconstruct a worn-out theology, or to abolish corrup practices, or to restore the standard of personal devotion and mora conduct. It was only by degrees that the ascetic, the humanist, and th doctrinal Reformer drifted into relations of antagonism; but this wa the position ultimately reached. And a stronger line of division appeare as time went on. There were some who refused to take any step whic

would separate them from the communion of the Church; as Carnesecchi expressed it, the Catholic religion was theirs already, and all that they desired was that it should be better preached. Others however felt compelled to withdraw from the fellowship of a corrupt society, still strenuously affirming that by so doing they had in no way departed from the unity of the Church. Of the former, many were influenced by the doctrinal movement in its most extreme forms, and some even died for their opinions without giving way. Of the latter, many recognised that their action could only be justified by the immediate claims of Christian truth. But in spite of individual divergences, here was a real line of division, in southern Europe as in the north.

I.

THE REFORMATION IN ITALY.

So far as the movement was one of protest against practical abuses, the need for Reform was not less widely felt in Italy than in Germany. Rodrigo Niño, the imperial ambassador to the Doge and Signory, wrote in 1535 that there were few in Venice who were not more Lutheran than Luther himself with regard to such matters as the reform of the clergy and their secular state. Venice was no doubt exceptional, and the state of feeling there was not that of Italy as a whole. Nevertheless, vigorous efforts after practical reform had begun in other parts of Italy long before this. Adrian of Utrecht, Bishop of Tortosa, the friend of Erasmus and the former tutor of Charles V, ascended the papal throne in 1522 with a firm resolve to set the Church in order, and to begin with his own household. In many ways he seemed well fitted for the task. A student of distinction, his uprightness, personal piety, and strictness of life were known to all men; and already, as Legate in Spain, he had taken a vigorous part in the reform of the Religious Houses there. But in Rome he proved to be quite helpless. Satisfied with the scholastic theology in which he was so great an adept, he did not understand the questionings which were beginning to stir the minds of others. The Romans had no fellow-feeling for a man who never gave way to anger or to mirth, and to whom the treasures of sculpture in the Vatican were no more than "pagan idols." The scholar who had done so much to foster learning at Louvain was to them only a stranger who knew no Italian, though he spoke Latin very well "for a barbarian." Moreover, the Curia was determined not to be reformed. Thus Adrian achieved nothing; he died unregretted in 1523, not without the usual suspicion of poison; and from that time forward every Pope has been an Italian.

But already an important movement had been inaugurated. Just before or shortly after the accession of Adrian VI, a number of earnest-minded men, clergy and laity, had banded themselves together at Rome

in the famous "Oratory of Divine Love," to work and pray for the purification of the Church. Their leaders were Giovanni Pietro Caraffa, afterwards Pope Paul IV, and the Count Gaetano da Thiene, who was subsequently canonised. The society consisted of fifty or sixty distinguished men, including amongst others Jacopo Sadoleto, Giammatteo Giberti, Latino Giovenale, Girolamo and Luigi Lippomano, and Giuliano Dati. They held their spiritual exercises in the Church of Santi Silvestro e Dorotea, of which Dati was curate, and consulted together on the evils of the day. In 1524 Gaetano withdrew to form a new Order of Clerks Regular, who were presently joined by Caraffa, and came to be known as Theatines from his see of Theate (Chieti in the Abruzzi); but the original society still continued to meet until it was dispersed by the Sack of Rome in 1527. Many of its former members, including Caraffa and Giberti, met again at Venice, where they came under the influence of the senator Gasparo Contarini. By degrees others were admitted to their consultations, including Gregorio Cortese, the Abbot of San Giorgio Maggiore, Pietro Bembo, and Luigi Priuli, and subsequently Brucioli, the Florentine exile, the learned scholar Marcantonio Flaminio, and the Englishman Reginald Pole. Contarini, still a layman, became from this time forward the leading spirit amongst them.

When the enlightened Alessandro Farnese became Pope as Paul III (1534), he found this group of zealous men ready to his hand. Contarini was made a Cardinal at his first creation, and Sadoleto, Caraffa, and Pole received the purple in the following year. In 1537, when he appointed a commission to suggest measures for the reform of the Church, most of its members were chosen from this quarter, the names being those of Contarini, Caraffa, Sadoleto, Pole, Fregoso, Aleander, Giberti, Cortese, and Tommaso Badia. The fruit of their labours, the famous *Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia*, was unsparing in reprobation of abuses and rich in practical suggestions. But although a few efforts were made to simplify the procedure of the Curia, the forces of inertia proved too strong, and the *Consilium* was little more than a dead letter. In after years it fell into bad odour, partly owing to its damaging admissions, partly because the Lutherans had taken it up. Moreover Caraffa came in time to suspect many of his former associates of heresy; and after he became Pope the work was placed on the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* of 1559. But, even had it been otherwise received, it could not have stayed the tide. The revolt against abuses had already opened the way to movements of a more destructive character; the new opinions were already making their appearance south of the Alps.

Italy, always a land of popular movements, was in many ways predisposed to welcome the new opinions. Some of them had been foreshadowed there, and revolt against the Papacy was to its peoples no new thing. The Cathari of the north, with their Manichean and antitrinitarian tendencies, had long died out; but the Waldenses, although

by no means so numerous as formerly, were still to be found in the valleys of Piedmont and Calabria. The movements of the sixteenth century in Italy were however entirely unconnected with these, and the impulse as a whole came from without. There is indeed one notable exception. Pietro Speziale of Cittadella finished his great work *De Gratia Dei* in 1542; but he tells us, with obvious sincerity, that he had formulated his theory of Justification and Grace thirty years earlier, before Luther had begun to preach. In the main he agrees with that of Luther, but he resolutely asserts the freedom of the will, and repudiates the Lutheran teaching on this subject; and although he speaks strongly against particular abuses, he does not undervalue the Church system of his day. The old man was thrown into prison in 1543, escaped six years afterwards by the help of two Anabaptists and joined their party, and subsequently made a formal recantation in prison. But Speziale stands alone; and it is clear that the doctrinal revolt as a whole came from the north.

The intercourse between Italy and Germany was very close; and a continual stream of traders and students flowed in both directions. At Venice there was a large Teutonic colony, having its centre in the Fondaco de' Tedeschi. The imperial army which invaded Italy in 1526 contained a large number of Lutherans; and with Georg von Frundsberg's *Landsknechte* there came the scholar Jakob Ziegler, later known in Venice as Luther's lieutenant. The commonwealth of letters ignored national boundaries; and there was a brisk correspondence between Luther and Zwingli and their admirers in Italy. So early as 1519 Luther's works were being sold in Lombardy by Francesco Calvi or Minicio, a bookseller of Pavia, who had procured a stock from Froben at Basel. In the following year, as we learn from a letter of Burchard von Schenk, they were eagerly purchased at Venice; and Marino Sanuto notes in his Diary that a seizure of them had been made at the instance of the patriarch, though not until part of the stock had been disposed of. Writings of Luther, Melanchthon, and others were presently translated into Italian; and being issued anonymously or under fictitious names, they circulated widely. Thus Luther's sermons on the Lord's Prayer appeared anonymously before 1525, and Melanchthon's *Loci Communes* about 1534 under the title *I Principii della Teologia* by "Ippofilo da Terra Nigra"; while other tracts of Luther's were subsequently tacked on to the posthumously issued works of Cardinal Federigo Fregoso.

In ways such as these the opinions of Luther spread, and in a less degree those of Zwingli. There were many who were ready to adopt them, in whole or in part. A hermit who inveighed against "priests and friars" at Venice in 1516 can hardly be called a Lutheran; but Fra Andrea of Ferrara, who preached at Christmas, 1520, at San Marco and in the open air, is expressly said to have "followed the doctrine of Martin Luther." So did a Carmelite friar, Giambattista Pallavicino, who

preached at Brescia in Lent, 1527, and others elsewhere. There were three "heretics" at Mirandola in 1524 of whom nothing else is known; but the Florentine physician Girolamo di Bartolommeo Buonagrazia, when proceeded against in 1531, confessed that he had been in correspondence with Luther in 1527, and accepted his doctrine. Nor was Zwingli without supporters. The letters of Egidio della Porta, an Austin friar of Como (a centre of heresy as early as the time of Julius II), prove that he and some of his fellows were ready to leave Italy and throw in their lot with Zwingli in 1525–6. In 1531 a native of Como who had spent three years beyond the Alps was preaching against the current doctrine of the Eucharist. About the same time priests at Como were laying hands on others, who were to administer the Eucharist in both kinds: one of them, Vincenzio Massaro, is said to have taken a fee of fifteen ducats from all whom he ordained. And a letter written in 1530 by Francesco Negri of Bassano, who had fled from a Benedictine House at Padua and joined Zwingli, and who afterwards drifted to Anabaptism, gives the names of many priests in North Italy whom he reckoned as "brethren."

The disaffected were very numerous. According to the ambassador Francesco Contarini, the Lutherans of Germany boasted in 1535 that their sympathisers in Italy alone would make an army sufficient to deliver them from the priests, and that they had enough friends in the monastic orders to intimidate all who were opposed to them. This of course is a violent exaggeration, and in Italy also popular rumour magnified the danger; yet even so it was not slight. The Reforming movement was especially strong in certain well-defined centres, the chief being Venice and its territories, Ferrara, Modena, Naples, and Lucca.

In Venice, where foreigners were many and toleration was a principle of the State, the Reform soon made its appearance, and before long found a home. Measures of precaution or repression were demanded by the Patriarch on behalf of the Roman Curia; but as late as 1529 the Signory was able to certify that, excepting for the tolerated German conventicles, the city was free from heresy. Soon afterwards however, in a report to Clement VII on the subject, Caraffa mentions, amongst other evils, the fact that many friars had fallen into heresy, and in particular the disciples of "a certain Franciscan now dead." Of these he names Girolamo Galateo, Bartolommeo Fonzio, and Alessandro da Piero di Sacco. The Bishop of Chieti was thereupon commissioned, by a brief of May 9, 1530, to proceed against Galateo; and from this time forward the extirpation of heresy was the ruling passion of his life. He it was who procured from Pope Paul III the bull *Licet ab initio* (July 21, 1542) reorganising the Roman Inquisition on the basis of that of Spain. He was its first head, and in 1555, as Pope Paul IV, he completed the extension of its power over the whole of Italy.

Galateo was already in prison on suspicion of heresy for certain sermons preached "Bible in hand" at Padua; but under the lenient system of the Venetian Inquisition he was soon at liberty. Caraffa now commenced a new process against him; he was found guilty, and sentenced to degradation and death. This led to a contest with the Signory, who delivered him from Caraffa's hands and consigned him to prison. Here he had been for seven years, when, on the intercession of a friendly senator, he was allowed to make his defence in writing. This *Confession* is remarkable. It is Augustinian rather than Lutheran in doctrine. It affirms the doctrine of saving faith without any extravagant depreciation of free-will or of good works; the system of the Church as a whole is defended, and the Pope is "the chief of shepherds." Galateo was allowed out on bail, but directed to amend his *Confession* on some points. He refused to do this, and three years later was cast into prison again, where he died in 1541.

Of Galateo's two companions, Alessandro was already in prison, and is not heard of again. Bartolommeo Fonzio had already incurred the enmity of Caraffa by his advocacy of Henry VIII's divorce; he managed however to clear himself of heresy, and soon left Venice for Germany, where he was employed as a papal agent. But he fell under the suspicion of Aleander and others by his intercourse with the Lutherans; and not without reason, for it was probably he who translated Luther's letter *An den christlichen Adel* into Italian. On retiring from the papal service he was transferred by Clement VII from the Order of Friars Minor to the Third Order of St Francis and permitted to return to Venice; but he was still an object of suspicion, which was not diminished by a little Catechism which he produced. After years of wandering he settled at Padua and opened a school; but it was broken up by order of Caraffa, now Inquisitor-General. Thence he passed to Cittadella, where reformed opinions were widespread, and again began to teach, soon winning the love of the people. But in May, 1558, he was again arrested, by order of the *Dieci*, and condemned after four years' examination for the general unsatisfactoriness of his teaching. He was called upon to abjure but refused; then gave way to persuasion and recanted; then recanted his recantation. At length he was sentenced to death at the stake; the sentence was as usual commuted into one of drowning, and he was cast into the sea on August 4, 1562.

Meanwhile, other teachers were going further in the direction of Lutheranism than Galateo and Fonzio. Giulio della Rovere, an Austin Friar of Milan, got into trouble at Bologna in 1538 for a course of sermons preached there. Three years later he came to Venice, and preached at San Cassiano in Lent, staying in the house of Celio Secondo Curione, of whom more presently. His doctrine was attacked; he abjured, and was sentenced to be imprisoned and then banished. He escaped and fled to the Grisons, where the Reform movement had already

taken root, the main impulse coming from the Swiss Cantons. Here he ministered, generally at Poschiavo, until his death in 1571. The Florentine scholar Antonio Brucioli, banished from his own city, had come to Venice and set up a printing-press. In 1532 (two years before Luther's German translation was completed) he published his Italian translation of the whole Bible, based upon Santi Pagnani's learned Latin version from the original languages; and this he followed up subsequently by a voluminous commentary. In 1546 he was in the prisons of the Inquisition, accused of publishing heretical books; and although it may be doubted whether anything of his could justly be so described, his troubles at the hands of the Holy Office ended only with his life. A more striking personality was that of Baldo Lupetino of Albona in Istria, uncle of the well-known Mattia Vlacich (M. Flacius Illyricus). He was a conventual Franciscan, and had held the office of provincial; an acute scholar and a devout man. Accused of preaching heresy in the Duomo at Cherso, he fell into the hands of the Venetian Inquisition in 1541; and, although the Lutheran Princes interceded on his behalf, he was sentenced to imprisonment for life, it being clear from depositions made then and subsequently that he was a Lutheran. In 1547 he was again in trouble for preaching to his fellow-prisoners, and was sentenced to be beheaded, his body to be burned, and his ashes to be cast into the sea "to the honour and glory of Jesus Christ." The Doge relaxed the sentence; but in 1555 he was again accused, and the following year he was degraded and drowned.

Nor were disciples lacking. The letters of Aleander, when Nuncio at Venice, speak of a great religious association of artisans existing there in 1534, the leaders being one Pietro Buonavita of Padua, a carpenter, a French glover, and several German Lutherans. The two first-mentioned were taken and imprisoned for life; but Aleander continues to lament the progress of heresy and the apathy of the Senate. We learn more about the Reformed in Venetian lands from the letters of Baldassare Altieri of Aquila in the Abruzzi, a literary adventurer who came to Venice about 1540, served Sir Edmund Hastwell, the English ambassador, till 1548, and after two years of wandering died at Ferrara in August, 1550. He acted as a kind of secretary to the Reformed, and wrote on behalf of "the brethren of the Church of Venice, Vicenza, and Treviso" to Luther, Bullinger, and others, begging for the good offices of the Lutherans with the Venetian government. The brethren are, he says, in the sorest need, and cannot improve their state whilst the Signory allows them no liberty. They have no public churches; each is a church to himself. There are plenty of apostles, but none properly called; all is disorder, and false teachers abound. Nevertheless, they adhere to Luther in doctrine as against the Sacramentaries, and do not despair, since "God can raise up new Luthers amongst them." But their appeals were in vain; the Lutheran Princes had their hands full already, and the Swiss were not

likely to help those who sided with Luther against them. In the end, their associations were broken up. Many were punished, many more gave way; those who were left seem to have gravitated towards anabaptist and speculative views of a very pronounced kind.

It is hard to form a precise idea of the number of the Reformed in Venice, but they were evidently very numerous. Processes for heresy were very common, especially after Giovanni della Casa became Nuncio in 1547, with orders to expedite the work. Of the records which survive many are at Udine; but at Venice alone there still remain over eight hundred processes for Lutheranism between 1547 and 1600, and more than a hundred more for Anabaptism, Calvinism, and other heresies. The greater number are from Venice itself; but Vicenza, Brescia and Cittadella are represented, with a number of smaller places.

FERRARA, long famous for learning and the fine arts, was a centre of hardly less importance, though in quite a different way. Ercole, the son of the reigning Duke Alfonso, had married Renée the daughter of Louis XII of France in 1528, and succeeded his father six years later. Renée had already imbibed the new ideas from her cousin Margaret of Navarre and from her governess Madame de Soubise, poetess and translator of the Psalms. The latter, with the whole of her distinguished family, followed her to Ferrara; and as most of Renée's suite, which included Clément Marot, the poet, were of the same way of thinking, her Court became a rallying-point for the Reformed. From France came the statesman Hubert Languet and the poet Léon Jamet; from Germany the Court physician Johann Sinapius and his brother Kilian, who acted as a tutor to Renée's children. There were also Alberto Lollio and the canon Celio Calagnani, joint founders of the Academy of the *Elevati*, the physician Angelo Manzioli, whose famous *Zodiacus Vitae*, published by him under the pseudonym Marcello Palingenio Stellato, poured ridicule on the monks and clergy; and Fulvio Peregrino Morato, who had preceded Kilian Sinapius in his office but had been banished in 1539, perhaps for Lutheran opinions. He returned to the University in 1539, bringing with him his more famous daughter Olympia Morata, "an infant prodigy who became a distinguished woman." She became an intimate member of Renée's household, corresponded on equal terms with the most learned men of the day, passed through a sceptical phase to devout Lutheranism, and finally, having incurred her patron's anger, married a German physician named Grunthler and accompanied him to his own land. Nor were Renée and Olympia the only well-known women who adopted Reformed views there. Amongst others who did so were Lavinia della Rovere, grand-niece of Pope Julius II, and the Countess Giulia Rangone, a daughter of the House of Bentivoglio. One other resident at the Court must be mentioned—the learned Cretan who took the name of Francesco Porto. He was a man of great caution and reticence, but

devoted to the cause of Reform. After studying at Venice and Padua and teaching for ten years at the University of Modena, he came to Ferrara in 1546 to take the place of Kilian Sinapius. The complaints of the Pope led to his expulsion in 1551. He was again with Renée, as her reader, in 1553, but then retired to Venice and ultimately to Geneva.

Hither also at various times came students and others whose lives were in danger elsewhere. Among these was the Piedmontese Celio Secondo Curione, a latitudinarian and a student of the Reformed doctrines from his youth. After several remarkable escapes from capture he fled to Padua, thence (after three years as professor in the University) to Venice, and thence to Ferrara. Through Renée's influence he received a chair at Lucca while Ochino was there, but after a short and troublous stay had to take refuge beyond the Alps. But Ferrara gave shelter to a greater fugitive than any of Italian birth. Early in 1536 Renée was visited by Calvin, who had come to Italy under the assumed name of Espeville. We have no trustworthy account of the visit, but it evidently made the deepest impression upon Renée and her Court. Apparently he celebrated the communion for them in private; certainly he incited them to protest against the accustomed services. In fact, on Holy Saturday (April 14), when the officiating priest in one of the chief churches of Ferrara presented the cross for the veneration of the faithful, one of Renée's choristers, a youth of twenty known as Jehannot or Zanetto, broke out in open blasphemies against what he regarded as idolatry. The incident was probably prearranged in order to cause a popular outbreak, but it is clear that the people were scandalised. Under pressure from Rome Ercole took steps to punish the offenders. But he found that the whole suite of his wife were involved; while Renée invoked the French power to protect her servants. The matter dragged on for some months; but at length, as the principal person implicated (probably Calvin himself) escaped from his guards on the road to Bologna, not without suspicion of their connivance, it was allowed to drop.

Henceforward Calvin was Renée's spiritual adviser, and she was in frequent correspondence with him. Under his influence she refused in 1540 to make her confession or to hear mass any longer. This does not seem to have involved an open breach with the Church; there were many more who were equally remiss in their religious duties. Ercole tried to avoid taking action, and winked at her opinions so long as she and her associates avoided giving open scandal. Moreover, when Paul III paid a visit to Ferrara Renée met him on friendly terms, and obtained from him a brief, dated July 5, 1543, by which she was exempted from every jurisdiction but that of the Holy Office. But she disguised her Calvinism less and less, while the activity of the Inquisition was daily increasing; and at length the pressure of the Holy See compelled the Duke to act. In 1554 he applied to the French King for an "able and

energetic" teacher for his wife, and the Inquisitor Mathieu Ory was sent. As his exhortations made no impression, she was put on her trial for heresy, and condemned to imprisonment, twenty-four of her servants being likewise sentenced. But a week afterwards, on September 18, it was announced that she had "abjured and received pardon." The documents are lost, so that it is hard to say precisely what occurred. It is certain that Renée made her confession and received the Eucharist, equally so that she was at heart a Calvinist, and went on in her old courses until, after Ercole's death, she retired in 1560 to Montargis and became a protector of the French Huguenots.

Ercole's other capital, Modena, was equally famous as a centre of learning. Many of the scholars of the Modenese Academy had long been suspected of heterodoxy, among them being Lodovico Castelvetro, Gabriele Falloppio, the anatomist, and the brothers Grillenzone, who were its founders. In Advent, 1537, an Austin friar, Serafino of Ferrara, denounced an anonymous book, the *Sommario della Santa Scrittura*, which was being sold in Modena by the bookseller Antonio Gaboldino; but his action only called forth protests. In 1540 arrived the learned Paolo Ricci, a conventual Franciscan, who had left the cloister, and now, under the assumed name of Lisio Fileno, publicly expounded the Scriptures and denounced the Papacy. Thus the new opinions gained ground. The annalist Tassoni (il Vecchio) declares that both men and women disputed everywhere, in the squares, in the shops, in the churches, concerning the faith and the law of Christ, quoting and misquoting the Scriptures and doctors whom they had never read.

Attempts were soon made to put a stop to this. The *Sommario* was refuted by Ambrogio Catarino and burned at Rome in 1539. Two years afterwards Ricci was arrested, taken to Ferrara, and made to recant. Other measures were for a time averted by the intercession of Sadoleto, himself a Modenese; he urged that the academicians were loyal to the Roman Church, and should not be molested because they claimed for the learned the right of free enquiry. The Pope however was still suspicious; and Giovanni de Morone, the Bishop of Modena, then absent on a legation in Germany and himself a friend of Contarini and to the doctrines of Grace, was sent for to reduce this "second Geneva" to order. It was proposed that suspected persons should sign a formulary of faith, drawn up by Contarini in the plainest possible terms. After strenuous resistance the signatures were secured, and the matter seemed at an end. But a strong feeling of resentment had sprung up, the Academy was still a hot-bed of disaffection, and preachers of doubtful orthodoxy, such as Bartolommeo della Pergola, were eagerly listened to.

At length Ercole was goaded into taking action throughout his dominions. A ducal edict of May 24, 1546, was so severe in its provisions that the Modenese Academy promptly dispersed; and in 1548

Fra Girolamo Papino of Lodi was installed as Inquisitor at Ferrara. A poor youth of Faenza, by name Fannio (or Fanino), was soon brought before him, who had fallen into heresy through his perverse interpretation of the Bible. He recanted once through fear, but relapsed, and began preaching throughout Romagna with great success. At length he was arrested at Bagnacavallo, and conveyed to Ferrara. Here his imprisonment was a succession of triumphs. His friends were allowed access to him, and his visitors included Olympia Morata, Lavinia della Rovere, and others, upon whom his cheerfulness and earnestness and his bold predictions made a great impression. After long negotiations between Ferrara and the Holy See, in which Renée herself took part, the order arrived for his execution as a relapsed heretic. It was confirmed by Ercole, and on August 22, 1550, he was strangled and his body cast into the river. His was the second recorded death for religion in Italy, the first being that of Jáime de Enzinas, a Spanish Lutheran and, according to Bucer, an eager disseminator of Lutheranism, who was burned at Rome on March 16, 1547. Another execution followed in 1551, that of a Sicilian priest, Domenico Giorgio, who is described as a "Lutheran and heretic." Minor punishments followed in great numbers; so that Renée was forced to send her Huguenot followers to Mirandola, where under the Count Galeotto Pico they found a place of refuge.

Some years afterwards attention was again called to Modena, where the Reform still prospered. On October 1, 1555, a brief of Paul IV demanded that four of the leaders, Bonifacio and Filippo Valentino (the former of whom was provost of the Cathedral), Lodovico Castelvetro (who had translated the writings of Melanchthon into Italian), and the bookseller Gaboldino, should be arrested and handed over to the Holy Office. Filippo Valentino and Castelvetro, warned in time, made their escape. The others were taken and conveyed to Rome, where Bonifacio recanted; but Gaboldino, on refusing to do so, was condemned to perpetual imprisonment. Four years later Castelvetro, already condemned for contumacy, was persuaded to go to Rome with his brother Giammaria, and stand his trial; but he fled before it was over, was again condemned, and was burned in effigy as a contumacious heretic. The two brothers escaped to Chiavenna, where Lodovico died in 1571, having in 1561 appealed in vain for a hearing before the Council of Trent.

Even this was not the end of heresy in the duchy. The registers of the Inquisition contain long lists of suspects, and not a few condemnations, both at Ferrara and Modena; at Modena indeed, in 1568 alone, thirteen men and one woman perished at the stake.

Very different again was the movement at Naples, at any rate in its earlier stages. It centres round one great man, Juan de Valdés, whose position is thus described by Niccolò Balbini, minister of the congregation of Italian refugees at Geneva, in his life of Galeazzo Caracciolo:

"There was at that time in Naples a Spanish gentleman, who having a certain knowledge of evangelical truth and above all of the doctrine of justification, had begun to draw to the new doctrines certain noble-born persons with whom he conversed, refuting the idea of justification by our own deserving, and of the merit of works, and exposing certain superstitions." He adds that the disciples of Valdés "did not cease to frequent the churches, to resort to mass like other people, and to share in the current idolatry." This however gives no idea of his real greatness. Valdés was at once a devout mystic and a born teacher; and having settled in Naples he at once became the leading spirit and the oracle of a wide circle of devout and cultured men and women who submitted themselves wholly to his teaching and guidance.

Born of a noble family at Cuença in new Castile (c. 1500), where his father Ferrando was *corregidor*, he and his twin-brother Alfonso had been educated for the public service. Both were early drawn into sympathy with the protest against abuses, but whilst Alfonso died an "*erasmista*," Juan advanced far beyond this. Alfonso entered the service of the Emperor, and, though an indifferent Latinist, gradually rose to be first secretary. In this capacity he was responsible for several imperial letters which urged the necessity of reform in no gentle terms. But these are not our only index to his opinions. He was a close friend of Erasmus and a student of his writings, and after the Sack of Rome in 1527 he put forth a Dialogue between Lactancio, an imperial courtier, and a certain archdeacon, in which he vindicates the Emperor, and declares the catastrophe to be a judgment upon the sins of the Papacy. Lactancio allows that Luther had fallen into many heresies, but very pertinently says that if they had remedied the things of which he justly complained, instead of excommunicating him, he would never have so lapsed. He calls for a speedy Reformation, that it may be proclaimed to the end of the world how "Jesus Christ built the Church, and the Emperor Charles V restored it." Alfonso follows in the footsteps of Erasmus; and the reader of the *Colloquia* will find little that is new here, unless it be that Alfonso is, as a contemporary said, more Erasmian than Erasmus himself. He was at once attacked, but found many defenders; and Charles himself declared that though he had not read the book, Valdés was a good Christian, who would not write heresies. Accordingly, he was not molested, and ended his life in the Emperor's service early in October, 1532.

Little is known of Juan's early life, excepting that he was for ten years about the Court, apparently under his brother. Towards the end of this period, and just after the *Diálogo de Lactancio* was finished, Juan produced a similar work, the *Diálogo de Mercurio y Caron*, in which Mercury and Charon are made to confer with the souls of the departed as to their religious life and the affairs of the world they have just left. It really consists of two distinct dialogues differing in style and substance,

one being mainly political (showing signs of Alfonso's co-operation) and the other mainly religious, although in doctrine it does not go beyond a condemnation of prayers to the Virgin. But they were joined in one, and published with the *Lactancio* in 1529. We next hear of Juan in 1530, at Rome, where he presently became a papal chamberlain under Clement VII, by whom, according to Carnesecchi, he was much beloved. He was at Bologna with the Pope in January, 1533, but soon afterwards removed to Naples, where he remained, excepting for one visit to Rome, till his death in 1541.

At Naples he gave himself up to study, to religious meditation, and to the society of his friends. Between April, 1534, and September, 1536, he produced his *Diálogo de la lengua*, a valuable study of the Spanish tongue, and one of the most beautiful writings of its day. During the next few years he wrote and circulated amongst his friends, in manuscript, his *CX Considerationes* (subsequently translated into English by Nicholas Ferrar), his *Catechism*, *Lac Spirituale*, a large number of short treatises and commentaries, and translations of parts of the Bible from the original languages. His doctrine as contained in these works is certainly not distinctively Lutheran or Calvinist, but that of one whose thoughts turned ever inward rather than outward, a devout evangelical mystic who recommended frequent confession and communion, and had no desire to overturn the ordinances of the Church. His disciples were won by himself rather than by his doctrines; and even the element of his teaching which others seized upon most eagerly—justification by faith only—was not to him what it was to the Lutheran, the corner-stone of his whole system To him it was the expression of the fact that only by self-abnegation could men receive the divine illumination, and thus conform to the image of God in which they were made. And the tract by means of which this doctrine was most widely diffused in Italy, the famous *Beneficio della morte di Cristo*, which has been called the *Credo* of the Italian Reformed, was not the work of Valdés himself, but of a disciple, the Benedictine monk Benedetto of Mantua, who wrote it in his monastery at the foot of Mount Etna, and at whose request Marcantonio Flaminio revised it and improved the style. It began to be spread broadcast in Italy about 1540, at first in manuscript and then in print, and made a deep impression wherever it went.

The personal influence of Valdés was very great, both amongst those who had known him at the Court of Clement VII and those who now saw him for the first time In his unprinted life of Paul IV, written early in the seventeenth century, Antonio Caracciolo reckons the number of Valdés' adherents at over three thousand, of whom many were leading men. This is doubtless only a guess, but the number was certainly large. And since at this very time, in 1536, an edict had gone forth in Naples forbidding all commerce with heretics on pain of death and confiscation,

it is clear that the many persons of importance in Church and State who took part in his conferences had no idea that their action came under this ban. Many, and especially the Theatines, regarded him with suspicion; but that was all.

He and his two chief adherents, Bernardino Ochino and Pietro Martire Vermigli, are styled by Antonio Caracciolo the "Satanic triumvirate." With them were Marcantonio Flaminio, Pietro Carnesecchi, Galeazzo Caraccioli (nephew of Pope Paul IV), Benedetto Cusano, Marcantonio Magno, Giovanni Mollio, the Franciscan, Jacopo Bonfadio, the historian (burned at Genoa, but probably not for heresy, in 1550), Vittorio Soranzo (afterwards Bishop of Bergamo) and Lattanzio Ragnone of Siena, all of whom were subsequently regarded as heretics. There were also Pietrantonio di Capua, Archbishop of Otranto (who attended Valdés on his deathbed and always held him in great reverence), the Archbishops of Sorrento and Reggio, the Bishops of Catania, Nola, Policastro, and La Cava (Giovanni Tommaso Sanfelice, imprisoned by Paul IV for over two years on suspicion of heresy), and Giambattista Folengo, a learned monk of Monte Cassino. With them, too, were the most noble and respected ladies of Naples, Vittoria Colonna, Marchioness of Pescara, her kinswoman Costanza d'Avalos, Duchess of Amalfi, Isabella Manrique of Brisegna, sister-in-law to the Spanish Inquisitor-general of that name, above all Giulia Gonzaga, Duchess of Traietto and Countess of Fondi in her own right. On the death of her husband she had retired to Fondi, where the fame of her beauty was such that the corsair Khair Eddin Barbarossa attempted to kidnap her for the Sultan. She had now taken up her abode in the convent of San Francesco at Naples, and was much respected for her strict and pious life. She submitted herself entirely to the guidance of Valdés; and several of his treatises were written for her benefit.

After his death most of his followers dispersed, and not a few of them were afterwards proceeded against in other parts of Italy. Those who still remained were led, according to a contemporary writer, by a triumvirate consisting of Donna Giulia, a Benedictine monk named Germano Minadois, and a Spaniard, Sigismundo Miñoz, who was director of the hospital for incurables. Some presently abandoned the Roman communion. Galeazzo Caraccioli, for example, visited Germany in the Emperor's service, and learned that it was not enough to accept Justification, but that he must forsake "idolatry" also. Failing to induce even his own family to accompany him, he went alone to Geneva in March, 1551, where he was well received by Calvin, as was Lattanzio Ragnone, who followed two days later. He ventured into Italy more than once, and many efforts were made, especially after his uncle became Pope, to recall him; but they all failed, and he died at Geneva in 1586. Isabella Brisegna also fled, first to Zurich and then to Chiavenna. Some, again, seem to have abandoned their views owing to the preaching

of the Jesuit Alfonso Salmeron in 1553 and the following years; and some, as the Austin friar Francesco Romano, recanted under pressure. Others still remained staunch, under the leadership of Giulia, who assisted with her means those who fled, but refused to fly herself. Several were proceeded against and put to death; and at length, in March, 1564, Gian Francesco di Caserta and Giovanni Bernardino di Aversa were beheaded and burned in the market-place. It is probable that only the death of Pius IV in December, 1565, saved Giulia herself from a like fate; as it was, she remained in the convent till her death on April 19, 1566. With her the party came to an end. Meanwhile, however, it had spread elsewhere: between 1541 and 1576 there are over forty trials for Lutheranism in the records which still survive of the Sicilian Inquisition, about half of the culprits, who include not a few parish priests and religious, being put to death. Other heresies had arisen also; the records speak, for instance, of Sacramentaries, Anabaptists, anti-Trinitarians, and those who disbelieved in a future life.

Lucca was the only other place where the movement assumed a really popular form; and here it centres round one man. Pietro Martire Vermigli, born of well-to-do parents at Florence in 1500, had joined the Austin canons at Fiesole in 1516, and learned from them to know his Bible well. He studied Greek and Hebrew at Padua and elsewhere, and being appointed to preach was soon well known throughout Italy. High honours fell to him: he became Abbot of Spoleto, and then Prior of the great house of San Pietro *ad aram* at Naples and Visitor-general of his Order. Here he came into contact with Valdés, began to read the writings of Bucer and others, and lectured on the First Epistle to the Corinthians. He was accused of heresy, and for a time forbidden to preach, but the prohibition was removed by the Pope at the instance of Contarini, Pole, and other friends. In 1541 he left Naples and became Prior of San Frediano at Lucca. This was his opportunity, for the Prior had quasi-episcopal rights over half the city. He gathered about him a body of like-minded scholars, and with them set up a scheme of study which was shared by many of the chief citizens and nobles. He himself expounded St Paul's Epistles and the Psalms. Latin was taught by Paolo Lacizi of Verona, a canon of the Lateran and afterwards Vermigli's colleague at Strassburg; Greek by Count Massimiliano Celso Martinengo, also a canon of the Lateran and subsequently pastor of the Italian congregation at Geneva; and Hebrew by Emanuele Tremelli of Ferrara, a Jew converted by Pole and Flaminio, who afterwards came to England. With them also were Francesco Robortello and Celio Secondo Curione, public professors of letters, and Girolamo Zanchi, afterwards professor of theology at Strassburg. Vermigli himself preached every Sunday to congregations which grew continually; and no small part of the city listened readily when he told them to regard the Eucharist as a mere

remembrance of the Passion. This soon became known beyond the walls of Lucca. Vermigli was summoned to the Chapter of his Order at Genoa, and the magistrates of Lucca received a papal injunction to arrest all heretical teachers and send them to Rome. An Austin friar was taken, released by the nobles, and recaptured; and Vermigli, never a man of much courage, resolved on flight. In August, 1542, he set out for Pisa with two companions; and "in that city, with certain noble persons, he celebrated the Supper of the Lord with the Christian rite." Thence he wrote to Pole and to the people of Lucca, giving as reasons for his flight the errors and abuses of the pontifical religion and the hatred of his enemies; after which he went to Switzerland by way of Bologna and Ferrara, and on to Strassburg. He subsequently came to England and was made professor of divinity at Oxford, but returned to Strassburg in 1553, and died at Zurich in 1562. It appears that no fewer than eighteen canons of his house left Lucca within a year, and escaped beyond the Alps. But although the shepherds had fled, the flock did not at once melt away. They were in a measure supported by the senate, which took measures at length to stamp out the heresy, but only under pressure, and as an alternative to the setting up of the Roman Inquisition. In 1545 the senate issued an edict against the "rash persons of both sexes who without any knowledge of Holy Scripture or the sacred canons dare to discuss things concerning the Christian faith as though they were great theologians"; and by 1551 the last Lucchese Reformers were compelled to fly.

We now turn to leaders of the movement who were not connected with any particular centre. One who was even better known fled at the same time with Vermigli, namely Bernardino Ochino, of Siena. When young he had joined the Friars Observant, and rose to be their Provincial; but in 1534 he left them for the Capuchins, a stricter body founded some six years before, by whom in 1538 he was chosen Vicar-general. Meanwhile he had begun to preach, was appointed an "apostolic missionary," and was soon recognised as the foremost preacher of the day. His extant sermons hardly account for his fame, but preaching was at a low ebb, and the strictness of his life added greatly to the effect of his fiery eloquence. At Naples he became a follower of Valdés, as did others of his Order; including, as he afterwards said, most of the preachers. At Florence he visited Caterina Cibò; and his conversations with her, put into the shape of *Sette Dialoghi* in 1539, afford clear evidence that he had already rejected much of the current theology. So far, however, he cannot have incurred serious suspicion; for although his preaching was impugned at Naples in 1536 and 1539, he was re-elected Vicar-general in 1541. The following year came the catastrophe. He was twice cited before the Nuncio at Venice for his sermons, and the second time he was forbidden to preach any more, and

went to Verona. Whilst living there, in frequent intercourse with the venerable bishop Giberti, he received a citation to appear before the newly-founded Roman Inquisition. He set out in August, and on his way through Bologna paid a visit to Contarini, who lay dying there. The accounts of their interview differ; but Ochino gathered that if he went to Rome he would be forced "to deny Christ or be crucified." At Florence he met Vermigli, and resolved forthwith to fly, to throw in his lot with the Swiss Reformers, and to disseminate his doctrine by his pen. He reached Geneva, being then at the age of fifty-five, passing afterwards to Zurich, Augsburg, England, and back to Zurich. But his restless mind could not easily find satisfaction. Before long the Swiss expelled him because of his views on marriage, and he began to turn to the party amongst his compatriots which had abandoned not only the historic system but the historic faith of the Church. As early as September, 1550, a secret Anabaptist meeting had been held at Venice, attended by 60 deputies, which had rejected the divinity of Christ. Many who shared these views had taken refuge amongst the Swiss, including Giorgio Blandrata, formerly physician to Sigismund I of Poland, Niccolò Gallo, Giovanni Paolo Alciati, Matteo Gribaldi, and Valentino Gentile, all of whom fled to Geneva, and Lelio Sozzini, who went to Basel in 1547 and lived there unsuspected till his death in 1562. Calvin at length grew suspicious, and on May 18, 1558, put forth a confession of faith to be signed by all the members of the Italian congregation as a test of orthodoxy. Gribaldi managed to clear himself; Blandrata and Alciati, finding themselves unable to do so, fled to Poland: Gallo and Gentile signed, but afterwards retracted and were proceeded against for heresy: the last-named was ultimately beheaded at Bern, in 1556, as a perjured heretic. After 1558, Poland and Transylvania became the head-quarters of this extreme school, which remained the prey of vague and mutually contradictory theories, Arian and Anabaptist, until Fausto Sozzini (1539–1604), the nephew of Lelio, came to Transylvania (1578) and little by little organised a definite "Unitarian Church," the doctrinal manual of which was the Rakovian Catechism. To this party, in its earlier stages, Ochino had made approaches (in his *Dialogi* published in 1563 in Poland); but even the Polish anti-trinitarians thought him unsound; and he died in 1564, forsaken and alone, at Schlackau in Moravia.

Ochino's flight made a great sensation. To Caraffa it suggested the fall of Lucifer. Some attributed it to disappointed ambition, some to a sudden temptation. Vittoria Colonna, hitherto a frequent correspondent, broke with him entirely; but Caterina Cibò, in whose house he had renounced the cowl, appears to have corresponded with him still. In the records of the Roman Inquisition she figures as *doctrix monialium haereticarum*, the nuns being those of St Martha outside Florence. But she does not seem to have been proceeded against, and died at Florence in 1555.

Another man of mark who left the Roman communion was Pierpaolo Vergerio of Capo d'Istria. He had been a lawyer in Venice, entered the service of the Nuncio at the instance of his brother Aurelio, who was secretary to Clement VII, and soon rose to importance. He went to Rome early in 1533, and was sent as Nuncio to Ferdinand of Austria. Two years later he went to invite the German Princes to the Council of Mantua, and had a memorable interview with Luther, whom he describes with characteristic bitterness. In 1536 he received the bishopric of Modrusch, exchanged soon after for that of Capo d'Istria; all the orders being conferred upon him in one day by his brother Giambattista, Bishop of Pola, who at the time of his death was suspected of heresy, and not without reason. Pierpaolo was still a restless and energetic papal agent, distrusted by many, and scheming both for practical reform and for his own aggrandisement. In time a change came over him. During a mission to France he met, and was profoundly impressed by, Margaret of Navarre. Passing into Germany, he consorted much with Melanchthon and others. At the Diet of Worms (1540) he made an oration *De unitate et pace ecclesiae*, in which he urged the necessity for a General Council for the reform of the Church. He allowed that there were grave abuses in the Church, but not that they were any reason for secession; he pointed to the quarrels amongst the Reformed, and urged them to return to "the Body of Christ, who is our consolation and our peace." His survey of the facts is somewhat superficial, but a new tone of charity and earnestness runs through it. He returned to Capo d'Istria to take care of "the little vineyard which God had committed to him"; he visited diligently, preached evangelical doctrine, and reformed practical abuses. He read heretical books in order to confute them; but they only raised doubts in his own mind. Suspicion arose on all sides. Late in 1544 the monks of his diocese, irritated by his strictness, accused him to the Venetian Inquisition, which began a process against him. It was still continuing when the Council of Trent was opened. In February, 1546, he went to the Council and offered his defence; but, although the Cardinal of Mantua warned them not to drive a good Bishop to desperation, they would not hear him or allow him to take his seat, and forbade his return to his diocese. Then he asked for a canonical trial from his fellow-Bishops, but in vain. After this he lost all heart.

The last straw was the case of Francesco Spiera, a lawyer of Cittadella, whose story was long remembered amongst the Reformed. He had incurred suspicion by associating with Speziale and translating the Lord's Prayer into Italian. Being cited by the Inquisition in 1548, he abjured from fear, and repeated his abjuration the following Sunday at Cittadella, against his conscience. Presently, he fell grievously ill, and lay for months under the conviction that he had committed the unpardonable sin by his apostasy. In vain his friends spoke of God's mercy; he met

their exhortations with a hopelessness which was the more terrible because it was so calm, though broken occasionally by paroxysms of frenzy. From the investigation made by the Inquisition after his death it seems likely that some rays of hope dawned upon him towards the end; but this was unknown to the many who came to see him, and awe and consternation prevailed amongst them. To Vergerio, who watched often at his bedside, the warning seemed to be one which he dared not neglect; he resolved to secede at once, and on December 13, 1548, he sent his resolve, with an account of the dying Spiera, to Rota, the Bishop Suffragan of Padua. His deposition and excommunication followed on July 3, 1549. He fled to the Grisons, and for a time worked at Poschiavo; in 1553 he passed to Württemberg, where he remained till his death. He translated parts of the Bible into Slavonic, and wrote fiery tracts against the Papacy; but to all he appeared a schemer and a disappointed man: Calvin speaks of him as a "restless busybody," and Jewel calls him a "crafty knave."

We return now to those who sympathised more or less with the new views but did not separate from the Church. They were of very different types. Some, like Michelangelo Buonarotti, were simply men of that evangelical spirit which easily comes under suspicion when undue stress is being laid on externals; others, like Falloppio, were bold thinkers who overstepped the limits of medievalism; others, like Giangiorgio Trissino, a fugitive for seventeen years who died in the prisons of the Inquisition, directed their satire against the Papacy only; others really adopted the Reformed views, like the satiric poet Francesco Berni, whose *Orlando Innamorato* appears to have been manipulated after his death to disguise the Lutheran flavour. A better representative of these last is Aonio Paleario of Veroli, a man of querulous temper but devoutly Christian life, at once a humanist and a doctrinal Reformer. So early as 1542 he was accused of heresy at Siena, partly owing to a dispute with a preacher at Colle, partly on account of his book *Della pienezza, sofficenza, e satisfazione della passione di Cristo.* But he had friends, and the trial was stopped without his having to read an oration which he had prepared in his own defence. He continued to write boldly, and to correspond with the German and Swiss Reformers. In 1542 or 1543 he unfolded to them an extraordinary plan for a Council to settle the religious disputes of the day: all the princes of Europe were to choose holy men, "entirely free from the suspicion of papal corruption," to the number of six or seven from each country; and these men, having been consecrated for the purpose by twelve Bishops, chosen out of their whole number by the Pope and the hierarchy on account of their holiness of life, were to act as arbiters and umpires, after hearing the matters in dispute fully discussed in a perfectly free assembly. Paleario became professor of belles-lettres at Lucca in 1546, on the nomination of Sadoleto and Bembo,

and in 1555 he went to fill a like office at Milan. Here he was twice proceeded against; in 1559 unsuccessfully in the matter of Purgatory, on the accusation of his former opponent; and again in 1567, when the trial was interrupted by a summons to appear at Rome before the Holy Office itself. He pleaded his age, but ultimately went and stood his trial. His answers on many points were unsatisfactory; but the real ground of his condemnation was his steady assertion that it was unlawful for the Pope to kill heretics, and that, so doing, he could not be the vicar of Christ. He was called upon to make a set abjuration, but refused (June 14, 1570); he was condemned as impenitent in the presence of the Pope himself (June 30); and on July 3 he was strangled and burnt in the Piazza del Castello. The records of the *Misericordia* say that he died penitent. It is probable that this refers to a general statement of penitence, by means of which, with the connivance of the authorities, the punishment of burning alive was frequently avoided. In any case, Aonio died a martyr not so much for his particular opinions as in the cause of liberty of thought itself.

Another who paid the last penalty was Pietro Carnesecchi. Born in 1508 of a noble Florentine family, he was educated in the house of Cardinal Dovizzi at Rome, and entered the papal service. Under Clement VII he became protonotary apostolic, receiving also many rich benefices and a promise of the cardinalate: so great indeed was his influence that it used to be said that he was Pope rather than Clement. But the death of his master removed him from a post which was not really congenial, and he retired into secular life. A visit to Giulia Gonzaga in 1540 brought him into contact again with Valdés, whom he had known at the papal Court. He now took him as his spiritual teacher, and ever afterwards regarded this as the crisis of his life. From this point his history is recorded in the details of the process instituted against him by the Roman Inquisition. After some years of reading heretical books and conferring with heretics at Venice, he was cited to Rome (1546) and put on his trial for heresy. He denied everything, and "fraudulently extorted absolution from the Pope." After a visit to France, where he met many of the Reformers, he returned to Venice (1552 c.), and there published some of the works of Valdés. In 1557 a new process was commenced against him; he hid himself, and sentence was pronounced upon him as a refractory heretic. Even this was not final. On the death of Paul IV (1559), the people joyously broke open the prisons of the Inquisition, destroyed the records, and suffered the prisoners (seventy-two "heresiarchs, or rather infernal fiends," says Antonio Caracciolo) to escape. Carnesecchi saw his chance and seized it. His sovereign, Duke Cosimo I, whom he had served as an envoy and councillor of State, took his part; the charges against him were no longer in existence; the new Pope was anxious to relax the severity of his predecessor; and thus, in May, 1561, he was declared innocent. After

this he resided at Rome, at Naples, at Florence, always in correspondence with heretics, and for a time with a strong Calvinistic bias, though later his sympathies were Lutheran. The accession of the stern old Inquisitor Ghislieri as Pope Pius V again brought Carnesecchi into danger. Cosimo consented to give him up (being rewarded two years afterwards with the title of Grand Duke); and on July 4, 1566, he was in prison in Rome. The trial was a lengthy one; he fought hard for his life, endeavouring, as was his wont, to resist force by cunning. But it could have only one end. On September 21, 1567, he was handed over to the secular arm, and on October 21, with a friar Giulio Maresio, he was beheaded and burnt.

But the great process against Carnesecchi had an importance apart from the man himself: as it has been said, he is but the secondary figure in it, and its real heroes are the illustrious dead. Carnesecchi was the disciple of Valdés, the friend of Flaminio and Pole; he had been on terms of intimacy with that body of loyal sons and daughters of the Church of whom mention has been made already, who had striven nobly, through evil report and good report, for its reformation, and who had been hopelessly beaten at the Council of Trent. They had been watched and suspected by the Inquisition ever since; some indeed had actually suffered at its hands. Most of them were dead before 1566; but the pursuit of heresy ceased not at the grave, and those who during their lives were revered as the hope of the Church were impugned as suspects or as actual heretics in the famous process of Carnesecchi. This Catholic minority, for such it really was, grew out of the body of friends who centred round Contarini in Venice, it was reinforced by many who had sat at the feet of Valdés, or who had travelled in the north. The aim of this party was the reform of the whole ecclesiastical system; its doctrinal rallying-point was justification by faith in Christ Jesus and not by a man's own works. So far they were at one with Luther. But, realising as they did that this had ever been the doctrine of the Church, they were not impelled, as he was, to deny the reality of free will, to depreciate the fruits of faith, or to eviscerate faith itself by reducing it to an act of intellectual assent, and divorcing it from Christian love which issues in action. "We obtain this blessing of complete and perpetual salvation," wrote Sadoleto to the citizens of Geneva, "by faith alone in God and in Jesus Christ. When I say faith alone, I do not mean, as those inventors of novelties do, a mere credulity and confidence in God, to the exclusion of love and other Christian virtues. This indeed is necessary, and forms the first access which we have to God: but it is not enough. For we must also bring a mind full of piety towards Almighty God, and desirous of performing whatever is agreeable to Him, by the power of the Holy Spirit." Moreover, loyalty to the Church was with them a

fundamental principle. Many no doubt were in frequent and friendly correspondence with the Reformers; but it must be borne in mind that the line of division between the Protestant bodies and the Church was very gradually determined, and that men long hoped for a speedy settlement of the existing divisions. Here again Sadoleto's letter illustrates their position. He recognises the existing evils in the Church, and will even grant that there are serious doctrinal errors; but even so, the evils of separation are greater; and to depart from the unity of the body of Christ is to court destruction. "Let us enquire and see which of the two is more conducive to our advantage, which is better in itself, and better fitted to obtain the favour of Almighty God: whether to accord with the whole Church, and faithfully observe her decrees and laws and sacraments, or to adhere to men seeking dissension and novelty. This, dearest brethren, is the place where the road divides: one way leads to life, the other to everlasting death." The letter is worthy of its occasion: so is the answer which it called forth from Calvin.

The failure of the *Consilium de emendanda Ecclesia*, the death of Clement VII, and the secession of Caraffa, had dashed the reformers' hopes; but they did not lose heart. Contarini was still their leader; and it was probably on this account that he was sent as papal legate to the Colloquy of Ratisbon in 1541, whence he kept up a correspondence with Pole, Morone, and Foscarari, afterwards Bishop of Modena. For a time all went well, and an agreement was come to, not indeed without great difficulty, upon the point of Justification. But neither side really trusted the other; and Contarini himself was jealously suspected by many members of the Curia. Consequently, the effort (the last real effort to conciliate the reformers) came to nothing; Contarini returned in deep sadness to Italy, and died the year after at Bologna. His place as leader of the movement was taken by Reginald Pole, whose house at Viterbo, whither he went as papal governor in 1541, became their headquarters. Here met together for prayer and study Giberti and Soranzo, the former bishop of Verona, the latter before long of Bergamo, Flaminio, Luigi Priuli, Donato Rullo, Lodovico Beccatello, and others. It was probably Pole's influence which kept Flaminio from seceding to the Lutherans. Not less was his influence with Vittoria Colonna, to whom he was greatly devoted, and who found in him a wise spiritual guide when many others seemed to have gone astray. It was he who advised her to believe that we are justified by faith only, and to act as though we were to be justified by our works.

Little by little their hopes faded. At the Council of Trent, indeed, Pole was one of the Legates, and there were not a few Bishops and theologians who were with him in the matter of Justification. But it soon became clear that the Council and Curia were against him, and Pole left Trent before the decree on the subject was actually made. He relapsed into silence, waiting, and advising his friends to wait, for a more

convenient season. It seemed as if this had actually come when, in November, 1549, Paul III died. The English Cardinal was beloved by some, respected by all. In the Conclave which followed it long appeared likely that he would be chosen; and the betting outside, based upon information from within, was much in his favour. But his views on Justification robbed him of the tiara. His rival del Monte was chosen, who took the name of Julius III; and Pole once more went into retirement until his mission to England in 1554. The accession of his enemy Caraffa as Paul IV was a still greater blow. Sadoleto's commentary on the Romans and Contarini's book on Justification were declared suspect; Pole ceased to be Legate and was for a time disgraced; Morone was actually imprisoned for heresy, and remained in prison until the death of the Pope in 1559. The Inquisition resumed its activity all over Italy. Although the total extinction of heresy was still long delayed, the end was only a question of time. For the springs were dried up, and no new ones burst forth.

II.

SPAIN.

Although one of the noblest leaders of the Italian Reform was a Spaniard, the movement never obtained such a hold upon Spain as upon Italy: in part because measures of repression were more promptly and more thoroughly applied—in part, perhaps, because many of the practical abuses had already been abated or removed, while the doctrinal abuses which called forth the protest had not yet prevailed in Spain so largely as elsewhere. Many of the best-known Spanish Reformers lived and died in Flanders or in some other foreign land; and in Spain itself the movement appears to have had little vitality excepting in and about two centres, Valladolid and Seville. Two *autos-de-fé* at Valladolid and two at Seville, of the thorough kind instituted by the Spanish Inquisition, sufficed to break up the Reformed in these centres. Many fugitives escaped and found refuge in Germany, England, or the Low Countries; and the few who remained were gradually swept away by the same drastic methods of the Inquisition.

A reform of the Spanish clergy, regular and secular, had taken place before Luther arose. It had begun, so far as the regulars were concerned, nearly a century before, for example, the Cistercians had been reformed by Fray Martino de Vargas in the time of Pope Eugenius IV, and afterwards Cardinal Mendoza had worked in the same direction. But the chief agent in it was Fray Ximenez de Cisneros of the Order of St Francis, to be better known as Cardinal Ximenez. At the request of Ferdinand and Isabella he drew up a report on the state of all the

monasteries of Spain. Thereupon a Bull was sought from Alexander VI in 1494, by which Cisneros was empowered to visit and set in order all the regulars of Spain; and he inaugurated the most drastic reformation, perhaps, that Religious Houses ever sustained. His action was in general submitted to; but his own Order, which was the worst of all, resisted strenuously, and obtained a Bull of prohibition against him. On further information the Pope annulled this, and the work went on. The monasteries were disciplined, their "privileges" burned, and their rents and heritages taken away and given to parishes, hospitals, &c. A large number of monks who were scandalous evil-livers, and who seemed irreformable, were deported to Morocco, and the work was complete. With the seculars Cisneros was less successful. But by degrees the regulars reacted healthfully upon them; Bishops and provincial synods took them in hand; and the earlier Inquisitors, especially Adrian of Utrecht, did much to put away abuses amongst them. Without doubt, therefore, the moral state of the Spanish clergy in the sixteenth century, especially that of the monks and friars, was immeasurably superior to that of the clergy in any other part of Western Christendom.

Moreover, the purging of the Spanish clergy had been accompanied, or followed, by a revival of learning. Ximenez was a scholar and a munificent patron of scholarship; and under his fostering care the University of Alcalá had become famous throughout Europe as a centre of theological and humane learning. The Cretan Demetrios Ducas taught Greek; Alfonso de Zamora, Pablo Coronel, and Alfonso de Alcalá were expert Hebraists; and amongst other scholars there were the two Vergaras, Lorenzo Balbo, and Alfonso de Nebrija. The greatest monument of the liberality and enterprise of Ximenez was the famous Complutensian Polyglott, which was in preparation at the very time when Erasmus was working at the first edition of his Greek Testament, though it did not begin to appear till 1520.

These facts have no little bearing upon the way in which the writings of Erasmus were received in Spain. To some he was a literary colleague whom they with all the world were proud to honour: to others he was a rival, whose work was to be depreciated wherever possible. Nor was it difficult to do this; for his satirical writings against clerical abuses really did not apply to Spain. Elsewhere, all good men were agreed in combatting the evils against which he wrote. In Spain, the earnestness of his crusade was easily overlooked by those who had not lived abroad; on the other hand, nowhere was there so keen a scent for heresy. His liberal thought, and his ridicule of religious customs which, however liable to abuse, were in themselves capable of justification, seemed most dangerous to the orthodox Spanish mind; and only the more large-hearted were able to discern the genuine depth of his piety.

Nowhere, therefore, did Erasmus' writings rouse such feelings as in Spain. Diego Lopez de Stúñiga and Sancho Carranza de Miranda

inveighed against him, the former repeatedly, accusing him of bad scholarship, of heresy, of impiety, calling him not only a Lutheran but the standard-bearer and leader of the Lutherans. Erasmus replied, publicly and privately, with comparative moderation; and by degrees the controversy died away. Meanwhile he had many personal friends in Spain, through whose influence some of his writings were translated into Spanish, the first being the *Enchiridion*, which appeared in 1526 or 1527 with a dedication to Manrique the Inquisitor, and bearing his *imprimatur*. Some spoke against it, including Ignatius Loyola, who says that when he read it (in Latin) it relaxed his fervour and made his devotion grow cold; nevertheless it had a wide popularity. This brought its author into still greater prominence; and a contemporary writer says that his name was better known in Spain than in Rotterdam.

Gradually two hostile camps were formed, of *erasmistas* and *anti-erasmistas*. In 1526 the Archdeacon Alfonso Fernandes, the translator of the *Enchiridion*, wrote to Coronel that certain friars were preaching against its author, and suggesting that they should be censured; on the other hand, the friars demanded that certain theses selected from Erasmus' writings should be condemned. In the ecclesiastical *juntas* which met at Valladolid in Lent, 1527, a formal enquiry was begun before Manrique and a body of theologians; but no agreement was reached, and Manrique dissolved the enquiry, leaving things as they were. Alonso Fonseca, Archbishop of Toledo, also took the part of Erasmus; and by the influence of Gattinara and other friends at the Court of Charles V a Bull was obtained from Clement VII imposing silence upon all who spoke or wrote against his writings, which "are contrary to those of Luther." Thus the *erasmistas* had won a complete victory, and for a time had things all their own way. But after the death of Fonseca in 1534 the tide turned. Juan de Vergara and his brother were cited before the Inquisition, accused, says Enzinas, of no crime but favouring Erasmus and his writings; and although they were ultimately acquitted, it was only after years of detention. Fray Alonso de Virués was condemned for depreciating the monastic state and was immured in a convent; but the charges were so preposterous that Charles V, whose chaplain he was, came to his rescue; and the sentence was annulled by the Pope. Mateo Pascual, professor of theology at Alcalá, was less fortunate; he had expressed a doubt as to purgatory in a public discussion, was imprisoned, and his goods were confiscated. Another who fell under suspicion was the great scholar Pedro de Lerma, who had lived at Paris over fifty years, had been dean of the faculty of Theology there, and had returned to Spain as Abbot of Compludo. In 1537 he was called upon to abjure eleven "Erasmian" propositions, one of which seems to have been justification by faith. He forthwith returned to Paris, at the age of over seventy years, accompanied by his nephew Francisco de Enzinas, in whose arms he died not long after.

"Erasmianism" gradually died out in Spain. Elsewhere it either died out, or took a line of its own (as in the case of Juan de Valdés), or became merged in Protestantism. Pedro de Lerma was on the border-line; his nephews crossed it. Francisco de Enzinas (or Dryander as his name was frequently rendered) was the younger brother of that Jáime who was burnt at Rome in 1547; they were sons of rich and noble parents at Burgos, and were educated at Louvain and Paris. On the death of de Lerma Francisco became a matriculated student of Wittenberg University, where there were about that time four other Spanish students, one of whom, Mateo Adriano, was professor of Hebrew and medicine. The young man lived in the house of Melanchthon, becoming so dear to him that he was often spoken of as "Melanchthon's soul"; and it was by his advice that Enzinas translated the New Testament into excellent Spanish. Having finished it he went to the Low Countries; and from this point we are able to follow his steps by means of his *Narrative*. The edicts of Charles V against heresy were being put into force, but he felt safe, as he had many friends. He presented his version to the theological faculty of Louvain for their *imprimatur*; but they replied that they had no power to give this, and could not judge of its accuracy. So he himself published it at Antwerp, with a dedication to the Emperor, in which he defended the translating of the Scriptures (against which, he said, he knew no law) and placed his own version under Charles' protection. On November 23, 1543, he arrived at Brussels to present it in person, and was introduced to the Emperor's presence by the Bishop of Jaen. After a conversation of which Enzinas has left a rather partial account, the Emperor promised to accept the dedication provided that the version was satisfactory; and it was submitted to his confessor, Fray Pedro de Soto.

Soto was disposed to be friendly, but took the precaution of making enquiries. The following day he sent for the young man, set before him the dangers of the unguarded reading of the Scriptures, as demonstrated by Alfonso de Castro in his *De Haeresibus*, and added that Enzinas had broken the law by publishing an unlicensed work , also, that he was still more to blame for consorting with heretics at Wittenberg, and for publishing a heretical book based upon Luther's *De servo arbitrio*. Enzinas answered, reasonably enough, that there was no law in Flanders against translating the Bible, and that if it was wrong to consort with the German doctors, then the Emperor himself and many more were to blame. As to the book, he denied roundly that he had ever published anything but the New Testament, a denial which it is very hard to accept. Ultimately he was committed to prison in Brussels for his civil offence, and thus was saved, evidently by Soto's desire, from the tender mercies of the Spanish Inquisition. There he remained, in easy confinement, until February 1, 1545, when, by the negligence, or more probably connivance, of his gaolers, he escaped and made his way to Wittenberg, and thence to Strassburg, Basel and elsewhere. In disgust at the discords amongst

Protestants, he seriously thought of going to Constantinople to preach the Gospel there; but instead of doing so he married a wife, came to England on Cranmer's invitation, and was made professor of Greek at Cambridge. There he remained for about two years; but in 1549 he returned to the Continent to arrange for the printing of his Spanish versions of the classics, and died at Augsburg on December 30, 1550.

Jáime de Enzinas had remained at Paris for some time after his brother's departure, and whilst there had imbued another Spaniard, Juan Diaz, with his own views. Born at Cuença, the city of the brothers Valdés, Diaz had studied for thirteen years at Paris, becoming proficient in theology and in Hebrew. About 1545 he went to Geneva, and spent some months in Calvin's society. Thence he passed to Strassburg with the brothers Louis and Claud de Senarcleus, the latter of whom, with the help of Enzinas, afterwards wrote his life. At Strassburg the tenets of Calvin were held in some suspicion, and before being admitted to communion Diaz was called upon to show his orthodoxy by making a public profession of faith. At the end of the year the city sent Bucer as its deputy to the second Colloquy of Ratisbon, summoned by Charles V; and by his desire Diaz was sent with him, meanwhile acting also as agent for Cardinal du Bellay, the protector of the Huguenots of France. At Ratisbon in 1546 he had a series of discussions with the Dominican Fray Pedro de Malvenda, whom he had known at Paris; but his account of these is very one-sided, and all that is certain is that neither converted the other. From Ratisbon Diaz went to Neuburg on the Danube. Meanwhile, news of his doings reached his brother Alfonso, who was a lawyer at Pavia. He at once hastened to him in the hope of being able to persuade him to return to the Church, or at least to abandon the society of the Germans. On the advice of Ochino, who was then at Augsburg, Juan refused to do either. Alfonso, maddened with fanaticism and the shame of having a heretic in the family, thereupon compassed his death, and, with an accomplice, cruelly assassinated him at Feldkirchen on March 27, 1546. The murderers were captured and brought to trial at Innsbruck; but as they were in minor Orders, Soto and others caused the case to be cited to Rome, where the murderers escaped scot-free. Not unnaturally the Protestants regarded Diaz as a martyr, and attributed his death to the direct orders of the ecclesiastical authorities; but though they connived at the escape of the murderers, the act itself was certainly one of private vengeance.

Another Spaniard who adopted the Reformed views about this time was Francisco de San Roman, a rich merchant from Burgos. In 1540, going from Antwerp to Bremen on business, he went by chance into a Lutheran church where Jakob Speng, formerly prior of the Austin canons at Antwerp, was preaching. Although he knew no German, he was attracted by the preacher, stayed at his house, and adopted his

views. He at once began to preach and to write in Spanish, with the eagerness of fanaticism and the self-confidence of ignorance. Returning to Flanders, he was arrested and examined; his books were burnt, and he himself was imprisoned. Being released after six months, he went to Louvain, where he met Enzinas, who rebuked him for risking his life uselessly by shrieking like a madman in the market-places, and for impiously taking upon himself to preach without a call from God, and without the requisite gifts or knowledge. The rebuke made no impression. In 1541 he went to Ratisbon and presented himself before Charles, who heard him patiently again and again, but at length ordered his detention as a heretic. He was taken to Spain, handed over to the Inquisition, and burned in an *auto-de-fè* at Valladolid in 1542. His fidelity won him commendation where his rashness and ignorance had failed; and after his death Speng wrote to Enzinas with the tenderest reverence and love for the man whom they had little esteemed while he lived.

Passing over Pedro Nuñez Vela of Ávila, of whom little is known save that in 1548 and again in 1570 he is spoken of as professor of Greek at Lausanne, we turn to Reform movements within Spain itself. Precautions had been taken from 1521 onwards to prevent the diffusion of Lutheran books in Spain. Attempts were not infrequently made to introduce them by sea: in 1524 two casks full were discovered and burnt at Santander, and in the following year Venetian galleys were attempting to land them on the south-eastern shore. But it was neither in Biscay nor in Granada that the storm burst, nor was it caused by the importation of Lutheran books. It began in Seville and in Valladolid, then the capital of Spain; and amongst its leaders, even if they were not its founders, were three chaplains of the Emperor, Dr Agustin Cazalla, Dr Constantino Ponce de la Fuente, and Fray Bartolomé Carranza, Archbishop of Toledo and Primate of Spain.

To begin with Seville. A noble gentleman there, Rodrigo de Valer, suddenly turned from a worldly life to one of devotion, studying the Bible till he knew it almost by heart. He also began to inveigh against the corruptions of the Church, preaching in the streets and squares, and even on the Cathedral steps, saying that he was sent by Christ to correct that evil and adulterous generation. He was more than once cited before the Inquisition, but treated with great leniency, partly because he was thought to be insane, partly because he was a *cristiano viejo*, without admixture of Jewish or Moorish blood. At length he was condemned to wear a *sambenito* and to undergo perpetual imprisonment in a convent. There he died about 1550. His life had not been fruitless: he had made many converts, amongst them the canon Juan Gil, of Olvera in Aragon. Gil, or Egidio (as he was also called), had studied with distinction at Alcalá, and was a master of theology of

Siguenza. About 1537 he obtained the magistral canonry of Seville, which imposed on him the duty of preaching. At first his preaching had little success. But he gained new views of truth by his intercourse with Valer, and before long he became famous as a preacher.

But he owed even more to his brother-canon, Constantino Ponce de la Fuente, than to Valer; for he it was who first taught him, in set terms, the doctrine of justification by faith. Constantino, a native of San Clemente near Cuença, had studied at Alcalá with Gil and a certain Dr Vargas; he was a man of great learning, skilled in Greek and Hebrew, who had probably learnt the doctrine of Justification from books. In 1533 he had been made a canon of Seville; and although he was not so popular there as Gil, elsewhere his fame was far greater. The three friends now began to work together, Gil being the most active. He and Constantino preached diligently; Vargas expounded the Gospel of St Matthew and the Psalms; and by degrees they gathered a body of adherents to whom they ministered in secret. For a long while nothing was suspected; in fact, Constantino was chosen by the Emperor to accompany him as his preacher and confessor, and was out of Spain with him from 1548 to 1551, much revered and honoured. He subsequently came to England with Philip II, and only returned to Seville late in 1555. During this period he produced a series of books which were then much valued, but were ultimately regarded as heretical.

Meanwhile, the others had been less fortunate. Gil, indeed, had been nominated by the Emperor for a bishopric in 1550; but soon afterwards he and Vargas were cited before the Inquisition. Vargas fell ill and died; but Gil was proceeded against vigorously, the charges including the points of Justification, Works, Purgatory, Invocation of Saints, and actual iconoclasm in the Cathedral. In prison he wrote an apology on Justification which was held to make his case worse; but ultimately, on Sunday, August 21, 1552, he made a public recantation in the Cathedral, extorted, his friends afterwards said, by fraud. He was sentenced to a year's imprisonment in the castle of Triana near Seville (the headquarters of the Inquisition), with permission to come to the Cathedral fifteen times; he was to fast strictly every Friday, to make his confession monthly, communicating or not as his confessor directed, not to leave Spain, not to say mass for a year, or to exercise other functions for ten years. Gil however did not modify his views. In 1555 he visited the Reformed at Valladolid, and died a few days after his return, early in 1556.

The Chapter of Seville had stood by their colleague nobly, although, or perhaps because, their Archbishop, the stern Fernando de Valdés, was at the head of the Inquisition. They paid Gil a considerable salary whilst he was in prison, and set over his grave in the Cathedral a fine monument; moreover, in spite of great opposition, they elected Constantino magistral canon in his place. He at once took up his friend's

work, and besides preaching began a course of Bible lectures at a school in the city. By degrees he also was suspected by the Inquisition, which frequently summoned him to explain his conduct. When his friends asked him the reason of his frequent visits to Triana, he replied, "They wish to burn me, but as yet they find me too green." As time went on he began to lose heart, and at length, in order to disarm suspicion, resolved to join the newly-arrived Jesuits. But they had been warned, and refused to receive one who would otherwise have been acceptable enough as a recruit.

At length the Inquisition obtained proof of what they had doubtless long suspected: there existed in Seville a sect of considerable size, whose members met together secretly and had their own organisation and services. They had grown up about Gil and Constantino, had increased rapidly, and had obtained copies of the New Testament from abroad through the activity of one of their members. The detection of this society led to the accidental discovery of a large collection of Constantino's writings, in which he had spoken his full mind. He was at once arrested. After a vain denial, he avowed that the books were his, and that they represented his convictions. He was imprisoned in the dungeons of Triana, and died two years afterwards of disease and privation. Meanwhile, the search went on vigorously; and by degrees all was discovered. From the *Sanctae Inquisitionis artes aliquot detectae*, published under an assumed name in 1567 by a former member of the sect, it appears that more than eight hundred people were proceeded against altogether. They had two centres, the house of Isabel de Baena, "the temple of the new light," the place "where the faithful assembled to hear the Word of God," and the Hieronymite monastery of San Isidro. Led by their prior Garci-Árias, known as *Maestro Blanco* from his white hair, the friars of San Isidro embraced the new views almost to a man, amongst them being the learned Cristóbal de Arellano, Antonio del Corro, and Cipriano de Valera; they abolished fasts and mortifications, and substituted readings from the Scriptures for the canonical hours. Amongst the lay members of the sect were Juan Ponce de Leon, second son of the Count de Bailén, Juan Gonzales, the physician Cristóbal de Losada, and Fernando de San Juan, rector of the *Colegio de la doctrina*; above all, there was Julian Hernandez, known to the rest as Julianillo, since he was very small of stature and "no more than skin and bone." But he was a man of fearless courage, and by his means they were able to procure religious books in Spanish, including the New Testament. Juan Perez, the former rector of the *Colegio de la doctrina*, had fled from Spain when Gil was arrested; in his exile he had prepared a version of the New Testament, which was published at Venice in 1556. By the courage and resourcefulness of Julianillo two great tuns filled with copies were safely smuggled into Seville, despite the watchfulness of the Inquisition.

Little by little the Inquisition got through its work, drawing its net closer and closer about the chief offenders and allowing lesser persons to go free on doing penance. At an *auto-de-fé* celebrated in the Plaza de San Francisco on September 24, 1559, fourteen persons were burnt to death for heresy, including four friars and three women. A large number were sentenced to lesser penalties; and the house of Isabel de Baena, in which they met, was razed to the ground, a "pillar of infamy" being erected on the site. On December 22, 1560, a second *auto* was celebrated at the same place, when eight women, one being a nun, and two men, one of whom was Julianillo, were burnt. Gil, Constantino, and Perez were burnt in effigy, and a number of friars and others were visited with lesser penalties. Some contrived to escape and fled from Spain; and a few single cases of heresy were dealt with in later years. Thus ended the history of the Reform in Seville.

At Valladolid the movement had already come to an end, for although it began later than at Seville, it was discovered somewhat earlier. Its founder was Agustin Cazalla, born of rich parents who had lost rank for Judaising. He had studied under Carranza at Valladolid, and afterwards at Alcalá. In 1542 he was made chaplain and preacher to the Emperor, and till 1551 followed the Court. On his return to Spain he was made canon of Salamanca and from that time forward dwelt there or at Valladolid. He became addicted to the Reform either under Carranza's instructions or in Germany, and was confirmed in his views by Carlos de Seso, a nobleman from Italy who had married a Spanish wife and had been made *corregidor* of Toro. Seso had heard of justification in Italy, and became an ardent propagandist; in fact it is clear that Toro, not Valladolid, was the real birthplace of the movement in New Castile. A large number of well-born persons accepted Seso's teaching, including the licentiate Herrezuelo, Fray Domingo de Rojas, many members of the Cazalla family, and many devout ladies; and all who accepted it became teachers themselves. Zamora and Logroño, near which town Seso had a house, were affected by the movement; above all, it found its headquarters in Valladolid, where it soon had a very large following, both of rich and poor. The nuns of the rich House of Belén, outside the city, were largely involved; so were many of the clergy. Meetings and services were held frequently, and the communion administered in the house of Leonor de Vibera, Cazalla's mother.

It is not known how they were discovered, but the arrests were precipitated by the action taken at Zamora, by the Bishop, against Cristóbal de Padilla, steward to the Marquesa de Alcañices, who was preaching the new doctrines there. He was able to warn his friends in the capital, some of whom fled to Navarre, and thence into France. But the greater number were already taken early in June, 1558; the

prisons were full; and Valdés the Inquisitor-General was able to report to Charles V, in his retirement at Yuste, that each day brought fresh evidence against them. Moreover, mutual trust was lacking; when under examination, even without torture, they accused one another and endeavoured by all means to exculpate themselves, so that there was no lack of incriminating evidence. The cause was pressed on vigorously, special powers being sought from Rome that it might not be delayed; and an *auto-de-fé*, the first against heresy, was arranged for Trinity Sunday, May 21, 1559, to be held in the Plaza Mayor.

On the appointed day a concourse gathered, the like of which had seldom been seen. After a sermon by the theologian Melchor Cano, the sentences were read out. Fourteen heretics were condemned to death, together with a Portuguese Jew. They were Agustin Cazalla and his brother Francisco (also a priest), his sister and four other women, and seven laymen, including Juan García, a worker in silver of Valladolid, and Anton Asél, a peasant. The bones of Leonor de Vibera were burnt, her house pulled down, and the spot was marked by a "pillar of infamy." Sixteen were reconciled, and sentenced to various terms of imprisonment; thirty-seven were reserved in prison. Of those who suffered, most showed sufficient signs of penitence to be strangled before being burnt, including Cazalla himself. But exhortations were wasted upon the licentiate Herrezuelo, who held to his opinions and was burnt alive.

A second *auto* followed on October 8, in the presence of Philip himself. Seven men and six women were burnt, and five women were imprisoned for life. The former included Fray Domingo de Rojas, Pedro Cazalla, two other priests, a nun of Santa Clara at Valladolid, and four nuns of Belén; of the latter, three were nuns of Belén. Several of those who were burnt were gagged that they might not speak; but Fray Domingo demanded leave to address the King, and said, "Although I die here as a heretic in the opinion of the people, yet I believe in God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, and I believe in the passion of Christ, which alone suffices to save the world, without any other work save the justification of the soul to be with God; and in this faith I believe that I shall be saved." It would seem, however, that only two were burnt alive, Carlos de Seso and Juan Sanchez.

Many isolated cases of heresy are to be found after this, and doubtless the records of others have perished. Leonor de Cisneros, the mother of Herrezuelo, was burnt alive as an obstinate heretic on September 26, 1568; several cases of heresy were dealt with at an *auto-de-fé* at Toledo in 1571, and recent research has found a certain number of other instances elsewhere. As time went on such cases were in increasing proportion of foreign origin. But wherever heresy was discovered it was ruthlessly stamped out. Nor was this merely the work of a few officials. From his retirement at Yuste Charles V adjured his son to carry out the work of

repression to the uttermost; and Philip replied that he would do what his father wished and more also. He told Carlos de Seso that if his own son were a heretic, he would himself carry the wood to burn him; and in this, as in most other things, he was a typical Spaniard. The rage against heresy regarded all learning, all evangelical teaching, with suspicion; to speak overmuch of faith or of inward religion might be a disparagement of works and of outward religion. Sooner or later most of the learned men of the day were cited on suspicion of heresy, or, if not actually cited, their actions and words were carefully watched. Fray Luis de Leon, poet and scholar, spent nearly five years in the prisons of the Inquisition whilst his works were being examined; and although he was at length acquitted, his Translation of the Song of Solomon was suppressed, and he again fell under suspicion in 1582. Juan de Ávila, Luis de Granada, even St Teresa, and St John of the Cross were accused; and it is said that Alva himself and Don John of Austria were not above suspicion.

Above all, the Inquisition struck, and not ineffectively, at the highest ecclesiastic in Spain, and brought him low, even to the ground. Bartolomé de Carranza was born in 1503, of a noble family, at Miranda in Navarre, and he entered the Dominican Order at the age of seventeen. In 1523 he was sent to the College of San Gregorio at Valladolid, of which he ultimately became Rector. It is possible that on a visit to Rome in 1539, to attend the Chapter-general of his Order, he met Juan Valdés. As time went on Bartolomé was more and more honoured in Spain for his learning and goodness. In 1545 Charles V sent him as theologian to the Council of Trent, where he won golden opinions. His doctrine of Justification was indeed questioned on one occasion; but he had no difficulty in showing that his words were in harmony with the decree of the Council, and he was vigorous in his treatment of heretical books. In Spain (1553), in England (1554), and in Flanders (1557), he showed himself zealous against heresy; and when, late in the latter year, he was chosen to be Archbishop of Toledo, his own was the single dissentient voice. Having at length accepted the office, he gave himself unreservedly to its duties. But it soon appeared that he was not without enemies. Some of the Bishops were ill-disposed towards him because he rigorously enforced upon them the duty of residence. Valdés, the Inquisitor-General, was jealous of him, perhaps because he himself had aspired to the primatial see. And the great theologian Melchor Cano, of his own order, was a lifelong rival. The two men differed in the whole tone of their minds; Fray Melchor was a thinker of almost mathematical accuracy, while Fray Bartolomé reasoned from the heart.

Under these circumstances very little evidence would suffice for a process for heresy; and Carranza himself, learning that it was in contemplation, wrote repeatedly to the Inquisitors in his own defence. Valdés however had applied to Rome for permission to proceed against

him. The brief arrived on April 8, 1559, the King gave his permission in June, and in August Carranza was arrested and imprisoned. The main charges against him were based upon his relations with Casalla, Domingo de Rojas, and others then under condemnation; upon his writings, especially the *Commentaries on the Catechism*, which he had published at Antwerp just after he became primate; and upon his last interview with Charles V. Of these the first head was by far the most serious. Many of the accused at Valladolid spoke of the way in which he had met their doubts in the early days of the movement; and Rojas in particular, desiring to shelter himself under the aegis of his old master, had in effect implicated him. The evidence showed that he had been in correspondence with Juan Valdés; and it seems clear that at this period his position had been that of the loyal doctrinal Reformers of Italy. Although he had willingly accepted the Tridentine decree on Justification, it does not appear that his doctrinal position ever really changed. His interview with Charles V had been very short, but he was accused of making use of words which savoured of heresy. The *Catecismo* was next examined: and, although some, both of the prelates and of the doctors, had no fault to find, others censured it severely. Melchor Cano in particular found much that was ambiguous, much that was temerarious, much that was even heretical, in the sense in which it was said. Nevertheless, the Tridentine censors had pronounced the book orthodox and had given it their approval.

The process dragged on its slow length, with many delays and many interruptions. At length the case was cited to Rome. On December 5, 1566, Carranza came out of his prison, and a few months afterwards he set out for Italy. Here the question had to be reopened, and the documents re-examined and in many cases translated, which involved a further delay. But it appears that Pius V was convinced of Carranza's innocence; and a decree would probably have been given in his favour had not the Pope died on May 1, 1572. His successor Gregory XIII reopened the case, and sentence was not actually given till April 14, 1576. The Archbishop was declared to have taken many errors and modes of speech from the heretics, on account of which he was "vehemently suspected" of heresy; and he was condemned to abjure sixteen propositions. Having done this, and performed certain penances, he was to be free from all censures, but to be suspended for five years from the exercise of his office, meanwhile dwelling in the house of his Order at Orvieto. The *Catecismo* was prohibited altogether. The decision was severe, but not unjust according to the views of the sixteenth century, which applied the tests of doctrinal orthodoxy to the minutiae of individual opinion. But Carranza was no longer subject to it; for seventeen years in prison had broken his strength. He endeavoured to fulfil his penances, humbly made his profession of faith and received the Eucharist, and expired on May 2, 1576.

Thus ended the Reform in Spain, as it had ended in Italy, uprooted by the intolerant dogmatism which assumed that there was an ascertained answer to every possible theological question, confused right-thinking with accuracy of knowledge, and discerned heresy in every reaction and every independent effort of the human mind. Many of those who had been driven out of Spain continued to work elsewhere. Such were Juan Perez already referred to, Cassiodoro de Reina, and Cipriano Valera, each of whom translated the whole Bible into Spanish, and many more. But without following these further, mention must be made of one great Spanish thinker of the earlier part of the century, who spent most of his life abroad. Miguel Serveto y Reves was born at Tudela in Navarre about 1511, his family being of Villanueva in Aragon; and he studied at Toulouse. As secretary to Juan de Quintana, the Emperor's confessor, he was with him at Bologna in 1529 and at the Diet of Augsburg in 1530 (where he met Melanchthon, of whose *Loci communes* he became a diligent student), but soon afterwards left his service and went to Basel. In 1531 he published his *De Trinitatis Erroribus*, and in 1552 two *Dialogues* on the Trinity: and the suspicion which he incurred by his views led him to flee to France. Here for the first time he met Calvin, who was his antithesis in every way, being as clear, logical, and narrow in his views as Serveto was the reverse. After acting as proof-reader to Trechsel at Lyons, and producing a remarkable edition of Ptolemy, he went to study medicine at Paris. In this field he greatly distinguished himself, for he appears to have been the first discoverer of the circulation of the blood. After a period of wandering, during which he submitted to rebaptism by the Anabaptists of Charlieu, he came to Vienne, where his old pupil Pierre Palmier was now Archbishop, and remained there till 1553. In 1546–7 he engaged in a violent theological controversy with Calvin; and when at length he published his *Christianismi Restitutio* the letters were added to the book as a kind of appendix. Not unnaturally offended, Calvin meanly accused his adversary, through an intermediary, to the Inquisition, and in April, 1553, both Serveto and the printer of the book were imprisoned. Serveto made his escape, probably by complicity of his gaolers, and was burned in effigy (June 17). He now resolved to make his way into northern Italy; but by a strange mischance he went by way of Geneva. His arrival was reported to Calvin, who resolved that his enemy should not escape; the blasphemer must die. On October 27, 1553, Serveto was burnt at the stake.

It is difficult to estimate his theological position; for his one follower, Alfonso Ligurio of Tarragona, is now little more than a name. Miguel Serveto stands quite alone, and towers far above other sceptical thinkers of his age. In some ways essentially modern, he is in others essentially medieval. He could not throw in his lot with any party because he held that all existing religions alike were partly right and partly wrong. It is impossible to judge of him by constructing a theological system

from his writings; for his mind was analytic and not synthetic, his tenets varied from time to time, and his system was after all but a framework by means of which he endeavoured to hold and to express certain great ideas—creation in the *Logos*, the immanence of God in the universe, and the like. But in his anxiety to correct the rigidity of the theological conceptions of his age he took up a position which often degenerated into the merest shallow negation; and his books on the Trinity are anti-trinitarian, not because of his teaching, but in spite of it. And thus, whilst supplying many elements which were lacking to the religious consciousness of most other men of his age, he obscured them, and marred his own usefulness immeasurably, by alloying them with elements of dogmatic anti-trinitarianism which were never of the essence of his teaching.

III.

PORTUGAL.

In Portugal the religious revolt never attained serious dimensions: there were a few *erasmistas*, and a number of foreigners were proceeded against for heresy from time to time; but that is all. Nevertheless, the prevalence of heresy was one of the reasons alleged for the founding of the Lisbon Inquisition; and the circumstances under which this took place may well claim attention here.

The social condition of Portugal in the early part of the sixteenth century was not a little remarkable. Great opportunities for acquiring wealth had suddenly been opened to its people by the discovery and colonisation of the Indies. The result was that they flocked abroad as colonists, or else left the country districts in order to engage in commerce at Oporto or Lisbon, which rapidly increased in size. But this had a curious effect upon the rural districts. Before long there were scarcely any peasants, and the few that there were demanded high wages. To supply their place, the landowners began to import huge gangs of negro slaves, who were far cheaper, and could be obtained in any number that was required. But this system had one great disadvantage, so far as the exchequer was concerned. It became increasingly difficult to get the taxes paid; for there was no longer anybody to pay them, the property of the merchants being for the most part not within reach for the purpose. And thus the King, Dom João III (1526–57), found himself in a curious position. He had great hoards of money in the treasury, but there was a continual drain upon them; and there were no means of replenishing them, although he reigned over the richest people in Europe. In a letter to Clement VII dated June 28, 1526, he complains of his poverty, and gives this as his reason for not succouring the King of Hungary in his resistance to the Turks.

Various expedients were adopted in order to replenish the royal treasury. Amongst others, a Bull of 1527 gave the King the right of nominating the heads of all monasteries in his realm, with all the pecuniary advantages which this privilege involved. But Dom João soon found that he could not make much from this source without scandalising his people and incurring the enmity of the Church. There was however a source of revenue, yet untapped, which was not open to this objection: namely, the *novos cristãos*. If he could proceed against them as was done in Spain, a lucrative harvest was ready to hand. Accordingly, early in 1531 the King instructed Bras Neto, his agent in Rome, to apply to the Holy See for a Bull establishing the Inquisition in Portugal on the lines of that of Seville, and urged him to use every means in his power to this end, since it would be for the service of God and of himself, and for the good of his people.

Bras Neto's task proved to be one of considerable difficulty. One Cardinal, the Florentine Lorenzo Pucci, declared roundly that no Inquisition was needed, and that it was only a plan to fleece the Jews; and his nephew, Antonio, who succeeded him as Cardinal, proved little more tractable. The Jews themselves had always been influential with the Curia, and they resisted strenuously. Bras Neto found that, for his purpose, heresy was a better name to conjure with than Judaism; and he did not fail to press the necessity for the Inquisition as a safeguard against it. At length he succeeded, and on December 17, 1531, the Bull *Cum ad nihil* was signed, which provided for the inauguration of the Inquisition at Lisbon. The reasons given were that some of the *novos cristãos* were returning to the rites of their Jewish forefathers, that certain Christians were Judaising, and that others were following "the Lutheran and other damnable heresies and errors" or practising magical arts. These reasons were, as Herculano has said, "in part false, in part misleading, and in part ridiculous": there were no Lutherans in Portugal; the *novos cristãos* had as yet given no trouble there; and the Christians of Portugal were no more inclined to Judaism, and less inclined to magic than those of other parts of Europe. But the allegations had served their purpose. On January 13, 1532, a brief was dispatched to Frey Diogo da Silva, the King's confessor, expediting the Bull and nominating him as Inquisitor-General; and it looked as if the question was ended. As a matter of fact it was hardly begun. For now began a series of intrigues and counter-intrigues on the matter, now one side getting the best of it and now the other. The brave knight Duarte de Paz, who was the agent for the Jews, worked for them with a zeal and vigour restrained only by the fact that he was a Portuguese subject. The King more than once procured laws which placed the Jews at the mercy of his subjects, and then had to withdraw them. Money, promises, threats were freely expended on both sides. Herculano calculates that between February, 1531, when the

matter was first opened, and July, 1547, when it was finally settled, over two million *cruzados* (or nearly £300,000) were paid by the King to the Papacy, without counting gifts to individual Cardinals. And since the Jews disbursed money even more freely, it is clear that one party at any rate was the gainer by the negociations.

To trace the changes in detail. On October 17, 1532, a brief was issued suspending the Bull of December 17, 1531. On April 7, 1533, this was followed up by a Bull which divided the *novos cristãos* into two classes, those who had received baptism by compulsion and those who had been baptised voluntarily or in infancy: the former are not bound to observe the laws of the Church, the latter are, but their past failures are condoned. The King was very angry at this amnesty and directed his agents to suggest various alternatives, one being that the Jews should be shipped to Africa so as to be interposed between Christians and Moors. But Clement VII did not waver. On April 2, 1534, he dispatched a dignified brief to Dom João, saying that he was not bound to give reasons for his action, but that he would do so as an act of grace; and he proceeded to give his reasons with admirable clearness. Not long afterwards he died. His successor Paul III seemed more tractable at first. But he would not withdraw the pardon, even when Dom João threatened to renounce the papal obedience like the King of England. At length however, at the desire of Charles V, Paul agreed to the setting-up of the Inquisition; and it was again provided for by a Bull of May 23, 1536. But the matter did not end here, and it was not until July 16, 1547, that the precise extent of the amnesty was settled and the Inquisition finally established.

Even when it was established it had very little to do with heresy properly so called. A few writings, for instance those of Antonio Pereira Marramaque, who insisted upon the duty of translating the Bible, were placed on the Portuguese Index; but it was far more largely concerned with foreign works than with those of natives. A considerable number of foreign students or traders came under its influence; for instance, the Scottish poet George Buchanan (1548 c.) and the Englishmen William Gardiner and Mark Burgess. Even the records of the foreign Church at Geneva, so largely recruited from Spain and Italy, only supply some five or six Portuguese names. So that Damião de Goes remains the one Portuguese heretic of distinction during this period.

Damião was born about 1501 of a noble family, went to Antwerp about 1523, and spent six years there in study. Then he travelled in the north, and returned by way of Germany, passing through Munster to Freiburg, where he stayed some months with Erasmus, and had long conferences with him. After this he was in Italy from 1534 to 1538, with one short interval, during which he came to Basel to tend Erasmus, who died in his arms on the night of July 11–12, 1536. In 1537, at the desire of Sadoleto, he began a correspondence with the Reformers at

Wittenberg, in the hope of bringing them back to the Church. He was at Louvain in 1538, and after fighting on the side of Flanders and being for two years a prisoner of war, he at length returned to Portugal in 1545. He was almost immediately denounced to the Inquisition, but as the charges were vague and the Inquisitor-General his friend, he was set free, and soon after was appointed royal archivist and historiographer. In 1550 a second denunciation was made by Simão Rodrigues, a Jesuit who had known him in Italy; it was more precise and therefore more dangerous, but although he was vehemently suspected the charges fell through. More than twenty years later, however, the charges were again disinterred. He was brought before the judge Diogo da Fonseca, on April 4, 1571, and remanded; and the old man of seventy remained in prison for twenty months while the charges were being investigated. He frankly confessed that he had been remiss in the performance of his religious duties, and that he had held certain points of doctrine which were then held by many great theologians, and were only subsequently made unlawful by the Council of Trent. This, he said, was between 1531 and 1537; and against it he set more than thirty years of blameless life. Nevertheless, he was sentenced to perpetual imprisonment. Here the King interfered, commuted the punishment, and sent him on December 16, 1572, to perform his penance in the monastery of Batalha. We do not know when he returned to his own home; but he died there not long afterwards of an accident—a judgment, as people said.

Such then was the work of the Portuguese Inquisition during this period in its relation to heresy. It was founded for reasons ostensibly religious, but actually fiscal; and although when once established it made Protestantism impossible in Portugal, there is nothing to suggest that the movement for Reform would have found many adherents there had there been no Inquisition.

CHAPTER XIII.

HENRY VIII.

1519–1547.

On his election to the Empire Charles became a much greater potentate in the eyes of all, and, as he was also the Queen of England's nephew, there were manifest reasons for England to desire his friendship. On the other hand, the close alliance of France, which Wolsey had twice succeeded in securing, however beneficial to England, was exceedingly unpopular. It had scarcely been contracted when efforts were made to undermine it; and soon a strong party at Court, headed by the Queen herself, endeavoured to prevent the French interview, which had been arranged for April 1, 1519, from taking effect. The new Emperor, equally desirous to counteract, if he could not prevent, the meeting, agreed to visit England on his way from Spain to Germany. Matters, however, had to be arranged beforehand, and though the anti-French party contrived to put off the visit to Francis till June, 1520, it was only in April of that year that the imperial ambassador in England succeeded in concluding a specific treaty. It was settled that the Emperor should, if possible, land at Sandwich in May just before the King went to France, or, if he failed to do so, should have a meeting with Henry at Gravelines after the French interview. He actually landed on May 26, at Dover, barely in time for a very hurried visit. Next day, which happened to be Whitsunday, the King conducted him to Canterbury, where he was introduced to the Queen, his aunt, and attended service in the Cathedral. On the 31st he had to embark again for Flanders, in order that Henry might fulfil his engagement with Francis. But a further meeting at Gravelines after the French interview was promised.

Wolsey meanwhile had taken care that this French interview should not be a failure. A great deal of negotiation, indeed, had been found necessary; but Francis, to facilitate matters, at last put all the arrangements under Wolsey's control, so that they advanced rapidly. The King crossed from Dover to Calais the same day that the Emperor embarked from Sandwich. At Guines on June 6 he signed a treaty

of which the counterpart was signed by Francis the same day at Ardres, partly bearing on the prospective marriage of Mary and the Dauphin, partly framed to secure French intervention in disputes with Scotland in a form which should give England satisfaction. The interview took place on the 7th, in a spot between the English castle of Guines and the French castle of Ardres. The scene, magnificent beyond all precedent, even in that age of glitter, was called, from the splendour of the tents and apparel, the Field of Cloth of Gold; and the mutual visits and festivities continued till the 24th, when the two Kings separated.

Nothing could have appeared more cordial, and the world was for some time under the impression that the alliance between England and France was now more firmly knit than ever. And yet, immediately afterwards, the King with Queen Catharine proceeded by agreement to another meeting with the Emperor at Gravelines, which took place on July 10. On the 14th at Calais a secret treaty was signed, binding both Henry and the Emperor to make no further arrangements with France giving effect either to the marriage of the Dauphin with Mary or to that of Charles himself with the French King's daughter Charlotte—a match to which he was bound by the Treaty of Noyon. Indeed, there is no doubt that in their secret conferences both at Canterbury and at Calais, the project had been discussed of setting aside agreements with France by both parties and marrying the Emperor to the Princess Mary. Of these perfidious compacts Francis was, of course, not directly informed; but he was not to be persuaded that the two meetings with the Emperor, before and after the interview, were mere matters of courtesy. He felt, however, that it would be impolitic to display resentment. The Emperor was crowned at Aachen on October 23.

In April, 1521, the Duke of Buckingham was summoned from Gloucestershire to the King's presence, and on his arrival in London was charged with treason. Information had been given against him of various incautious expressions tending to show that, being of the blood of Lancaster, he had some expectation of succeeding to the Crown, the fulfilment of which events might hasten; also, that, should he succeed, Wolsey and Sir Thomas Lovel would be beheaded; and further, that if he had been arrested on an occasion when the King had been displeased with him, he would have tried, as his father had with Richard III, to get access to the King's presence and would then have stabbed him. That this testimony was strongly coloured by malice, there is little doubt. But the Duke had a formal trial before the Duke of Norfolk as High Steward, and was found guilty by seventeen of his peers. He was beheaded on Tower Hill on May 17, to the general regret of the people.

At this time Francis I had stirred up war against the Emperor, who was already perplexed with a rebellion in Spain, while occupied in Germany with Luther and the Diet of Worms. Charles, hard pressed,

was willing to accept Henry's mediation, and the French, after some reverses for which their early success had not prepared them, were glad to accept it also. But the Imperialists changed their tone with the change of fortune, and demanded Henry's aid by the treaty of London against the aggressor. Wolsey was sent to Calais to hear deputies of both sides and adjust the differences. On opening the conference, he found the Imperialists intractable; they had no power to treat, only to demand aid of England. But Wolsey, they said, might visit the Emperor himself, who was then at Bruges, to discuss matters. This strange proceeding, as State-papers show, had been certainly planned between Wolsey and the Imperialists beforehand; and the Cardinal suspended the conference, making plausible excuses to the French, while he went to the Emperor at Bruges and concluded with him a secret treaty against France on August 25. It would seem, however, that the terms of this treaty were the subject of prolonged discussion before it was concluded; and Wolsey, instead of being only eight days absent from Calais, as he told the Frenchmen he would be, was away for nearly three weeks. He had successfully contended, among other things, that if a suspension of hostilities could be obtained in the meantime, England should not be bound to declare war against France till March, 1523. On his return to Calais he laboured hard to bring about this suspension, but in vain. The capture of Fuenterrabia by the French in October, and their refusal to restore it, or even to put it into the hands of England for a time as security, finally wrecked the conference, and Wolsey returned to England in November. His health had given way at times during these proceedings, and he was certainly disappointed at the result. But he was rewarded by the King with the abbey of St Alban's in addition to his other preferments.

Pope Leo X died on December 2 following. Charles V had promised Wolsey at Bruges that on the first vacancy of the papal chair he would do his best to make him Pope, and the King sent Pace to Rome to help to procure his election. The Emperor wrote to Wolsey that he had not forgotten his promise, but he certainly did not keep it, and in January, 1522, Adrian VI was elected. It may be doubted whether Wolsey was much disappointed; but he knew now what reliance to place on a promise of Charles V. On February 2 he and the papal ambassador presented to the King the deceased Pope's Bull bestowing upon him the title of Defender of the Faith, in acknowledgment of the service he had done the Church by writing a book against Luther.

Henry had been more eager to take part with the Emperor than Wolsey thought prudent. Charles now required a loan and claimed from Henry fulfilment of a promise of the pay of 3000 men in the Netherlands. He was already in Henry's debt; but Wolsey was disposed to allow him a further advance of 100,000 crowns on condition that the

ing should not be called on to declare openly against Francis till the money was refunded. This did not suit Charles at all, and he hastened n another visit which he was to pay to Henry on his way back to pain, and arrived at Dover again in 1522 on May 26—the very ay of his landing there two years before. He was feasted and entertained even more than he cared for at Greenwich, London, and Windsor, . which last place on June 19 he bound himself by a new treaty marry Mary when she had completed her twelfth year. But he cured a further loan of 50,000 crowns, and had the satisfaction, during is stay, of seeing Henry committed to immediate war with France by n open declaration of hostility, which the English herald Clarencieux ade to Francis at Lyons on May 29. On July 2 a further treaty as concluded for the conduct of the war, and on the 6th the Emperor iled from Southampton. Just before his departure he gave Wolsey a tent for a pension of 2500 ducats on vacant bishoprics in Spain, and iaranteed him the continuance of another pension which Francis had therto paid him in recompense for the bishopric of Tournay, that ty having surrendered to the Imperialists on December 1. But panish pensions were commonly in arrear, and that charged on the panish bishoprics was only in lieu of one specifically charged on the e of Badajoz, which the Emperor had already granted to Wolsey in 520. Nor was Charles at all ready at any time, when called upon, pay his debts to the King himself.

It was no surprise to Francis when England declared war against m. As a means of keeping Henry in check, he had again let Albany id his way to Scotland while the Calais conferences were still going on 1521. He pretended that he had not connived at Albany's escape, and made a show of urging him to return; but he meant to make use of him Scotland. Albany, on his arrival, desired of Henry a prolongation of ie truce between the two kingdoms, in which France should be included. vidently France was so impoverished by taxation that she would have en glad to stave off war by any means. But Henry would hear nothing out prolonging the truce while Albany was in Scotland; and he wrote the Estates of that country in January, 1522, not to allow him to main there, seeing that he had escaped from France surreptitiously id his presence was not even safe for their King. This was just hat Henry had told them before; but it was a stranger plea to urge ian formerly; for this time Queen Margaret, James V's own mother, id solicited Albany's return. She, indeed, had found it hard to live nid a factious nobility, especially as she had been neglected by her own isband, from whom she was now seeking a divorce. But Henry had nall regard for his sister's good name, and insinuated that it was lbany who had tried to separate her from her husband, with the itention of marrying her himself. Such a charge was scarcely even lausible, for Albany had a wife then living, with whom, as he told the

English herald, he was perfectly satisfied. The Estates of Scotland made a very temperate but firm reply, saying they were prepared to live and die with their Governor, while both Margaret and Albany repelled the shameful insinuations against them, certainly not with greater vehemence than the case deserved. Henry then sent a fleet to the Firth of Forth, and some raids into Scotland took place, in which Kelso was partly burned

As to France, so soon after the declaration of war as the wind would serve and bad victualling arrangements permit, a force under the Earl of Surrey as Lord Admiral sailed from Southampton, and on July 1 sacked and burned the town of Morlaix in Britanny, setting fire to the shipping in the harbour. It then returned with a rich booty to the Solent; for the merchants of Morlaix had stores of linen cloths. There was also some desultory fighting about Calais and Boulogne; but nothing noteworthy was done till September, when Surrey, now the commander of an invading force, in co-operation with an imperial army, burned and destroyed with great barbarity a number of places in Picardy. Hesdin also was besieged, and the town much injured, but it was found difficult to assault the castle, and the besiegers withdrew. The season was wet, the artillery difficult to move, and the understanding between the allies not altogether satisfactory. Surrey's empty victories won him great applause in England; but he returned to Calais in October.

Meantime the Scots had created some alarm. In May, for want of French support, Albany had been on the point of withdrawing from the country and letting peace be made, when some slender succours came; moreover, the English raids called for retribution. Albany advanced to the borders at the head of a very numerous army, intending to invade England on September 2. Though the design was known even in July, when the Earl of Shrewsbury was appointed lieutenant-general of an army to be sent against Scotland, the borders were ill prepared to resist, and Carlisle, against which Albany's great host was directed, was defenceless. But Lord Dacre, Warden of the Marches, was equal to the emergency. Towards the close of August he sent secret messages to Albany, which led to negotiations, though he acknowledged that he had no powers to treat; and he appealed to Margaret to use her influence for peace, which would become more hopeless than ever between the kingdoms if arrangements were not made at once. He effectually concealed the weakness of his own position, and caused the enemy to waste time till, at length, on September 11, Albany agreed with him for one month's abstinence from war, and disbanded his army. Wolsey was much relieved, and Dacre was thanked for his astuteness. It was in vain, now, that Albany in further negotiations pressed for the comprehension of France; and he sailed again for that country in October, leaving a Council of Regency in Scotland, and promising to return in the following August.

Much money was wanted for the French war. Wolsey had not only levied from the City of London a loan of £20,000, but afterwards, on August 20, had sent for the mayor and chief citizens to inform them that commissioners were appointed over all the country to swear every man to the value of his moveable property, of which it was thought that everyone should give a tenth; and though some had already contributed to the loan as much as a fifth of their goods, they were told that the loan would only be allowed as part of the tenth to be exacted from the whole city. Nor was even this enough; for Parliament, which had not met for more than seven years, was called in April, 1523, expressly for further supplies. A subsidy of £800,000 was demanded, for which the Commons were asked to impose a property tax of four shillings in the pound on every man's goods and lands. Sir Thomas More, who was elected Speaker, backed up the demand, but it was resisted as impossible. There was not coin, it was said, out of the King's hands in all the realm to pay it. Cardinal Wolsey came down to the House, and would have discussed the matter; but the Commons pleaded their privileges, and he contented himself with setting before them evidences of the increased prosperity of the country, and withdrew. After long debate a grant was made of two shillings in the pound, payable in two years, on every man's lands or goods who was worth £20, with smaller rates on men of inferior means. But Wolsey insisted that this was not enough, and ultimately further grants were made of one shilling in the pound on landed property, to be paid in three years, and one shilling in the pound on goods, to be paid in the fourth year. The amount was unprecedented. The Parliament sat continuously, except for a break at Whitsuntide, till August 13, when it was dissolved. The clergy were also taxed at the same time through their convocations, that of Canterbury meeting at first at St Paul's, and that of York under Wolsey at Westminster; an attempt of Wolsey to induce them to resolve themselves into a single national synod failed. They were permitted to vote their money in the usual way; and, after much opposition, a grant was made of half a year's revenue from all benefices, payable in five years.

The war, which had languished somewhat since Surrey's invasion of France, was now renewed with greater vigour. In August the Duke of Suffolk was appointed Captain-general of a new invading army—a larger one, it was said, than had sailed from England for a hundred years. France was not only in great poverty but was now isolated. Scotland could not help her, and her old ally, Venice, had turned against her, not being allowed to remain neutral. Moreover, Henry was calculating on the disaffection of the Duke of Bourbon, with whom both he and the Emperor had been for some time secretly in communication. In September the Duke's sudden defection took Francis by surprise, and compelled him to desist from conducting personally a new expedition into Italy. Meanwhile Suffolk, having crossed the Channel, was joined by a considerable

force under Count van Buren, not, however, well provided with waggons and means of transport, while France was harassed elsewhere by the Imperialists. But the invading armies were weakened by divided counsels; a plan of besieging Boulogne was given up, and the allies only devastated Picardy, took Bray by assault, and compelled Ancre and Montdidier to surrender. It was reported in England that Suffolk was on his way to Paris, and, that he might have the means to follow up his advantages, commissions were issued on November 2 to press all over England for what was called an "anticipation," that is to say, for payment by those possessed of £40 in lands or goods of the first assessment of the subsidy, before the term when it was legally due. The money was gathered in. But before the month of November was out, Buren had disbanded his forces, and Suffolk had returned to Calais. A severe frost had produced intense suffering, and it was found impossible to preserve discipline. The King had determined to send over Lord Mountjoy with reinforcements; but, before he could be sent, the English troops had taken their own way home through Flanders, and many of them shipped at Antwerp, Sluys, and Nieuport.

Meantime, though later than he promised, eluding English efforts to intercept him, Albany had again crossed the sea to Scotland. During all the time of his absence Henry had persistently tried to undermine his influence and weaken the Scotch alliance with France. For this it was not difficult to make further use of Margaret, who, in the hope of seeing her old authority restored, was soon persuaded once more to desert Albany. A truce had been arranged with the lords without reference to him, and Albany in France took serious alarm at rumours that Henry had been negotiating to keep him permanently out of Scotland with the suggestion of marrying James to the Princess Mary. But the truce was allowed to expire in February, when Surrey was appointed lieutenant-general of the army against Scotland, and under his direction the Marquis of Dorset, who was appointed Warden of the East Marches, invaded Teviotdale in April, 1523. A series of further invasions was kept up all through the summer, and, just when Albany returned in September, Surrey succeeded in laying Jedburgh in ashes—till then a great fortified town more populous than Berwick. He met, however, with a most obstinate resistance, and was thrown on the defensive when Albany, immediately on his arrival, prepared to invade in his turn. Knowing the weakness of Berwick and the strength of Albany's reinforcements, Surrey was seriously alarmed. But Wolsey had reason for believing his fears to be exaggerated, as the event proved them to be. Encumbered by heavy artillery Albany moved slowly, and at last laid siege to Wark Castle on November 1. The fortress seemed in real danger, the outer works being actually won; but the garrison made a gallant defence, and next day, as Surrey was coming to the rescue, Albany suddenly gave up the siege, and returned to Edinburgh.

His mysterious retreat was branded by the English as a shameful flight, and satirised in contemptuous verse by Skelton, the poet laureate. But the truth seems to be that several of the Scotch lords deprecated a policy of invasion as being only in the interest of France. Albany's influence was clearly on the wane; for next year he met a Parliament in May, and again obtained leave for a brief visit to France on the understanding that if he did not return in August his authority was at an end. He left immediately and never returned again.

Meanwhile, on the death of Adrian VI in September, 1523, Charles V again promised with the same insincerity as before to advance Wolsey's candidature for the papacy as advantageous alike to England and himself. But on November 19 Giuliano de' Medici, a great friend of both princes, was elected as Clement VII. He soon after confirmed for life Wolsey's legatine authority, which at first had been only temporary but had been prolonged from time to time.

In 1524 the war made little progress after February, when the Emperor recovered Fuenterrabia; all parties were exhausted. But little came of the mission of a Nuncio (Nicholas von Schomberg, Archbishop of Capua), whom the Pope sent to France, Spain, and England successively to mediate a peace. Negotiations went on with Bourbon on the part both of the Emperor and Henry for a joint attack on France. But the King and Wolsey had long suspected the Emperor's sincerity, and were determined that there should be either peace or war in earnest. Bourbon invaded Provence, and laid siege to Marseilles; whereupon orders were issued in England, September 10, to prepare for a royal invasion in aid of the Duke. The siege of Marseilles, in itself, was entirely in the Emperor's interest; no English army crossed the Channel, and Bourbon was forced to abandon the enterprise.

Henry, in the meantime, had been feeling his way to a separate peace with France, in case the Emperor showed himself remiss in fulfilling his engagements. In June a Genoese merchant, Giovanni Joachino Passano, came over to London, as if on ordinary business. He was soon known to be an agent of Louise of Savoy, the French King's mother, who had been left Regent in her son's absence. His stay in England was unpopular with the English, but his secret negotiations with Wolsey were disavowed, and in January, 1525, another French agent, Brinon, President of Rouen, joined him in London.

Francis, seeing how matters lay, made a sudden descent into Italy and recovered Milan, which he had lost in the spring. But the protracted siege of Pavia ended with the defeat and capture of the French King, which seemed to throw everything into the Emperor's hands, and it was not likely that he would share with his allies the fruits of his victory. Wolsey, however, had been ordering matters so as to secure his master's interests, whether the French should succeed or fail

in Italy; and just before the news of the battle reached England he had taken a most extraordinary step to cover his communications with the French agent. A watchman arrested one night a messenger of de Praet, the Imperial ambassador, as a suspicious character. His letters were taken and brought to Wolsey, who first opened and read them, then sent for the ambassador and upbraided him for the terms (very uncomplimentary, certainly, to himself) in which he had dared to write to his own sovereign. The King himself followed this up by a letter to the Emperor, desiring him to punish de Praet as a mischief-maker trying to disturb the cordiality between them; and Charles, afraid to alienate Henry, made only a mild remonstrance against the insult.

Just after this occurrence, and before news had yet arrived of the great event at Pavia, an important embassy came over from Flanders, from the Emperor's aunt, Margaret of Savoy. The situation in Italy was then so doubtful, and the Imperial forces there so distressed for want of means, that England was to be urged to send a large army over sea to create a diversion by a new joint attack on the North of France Another request was, that the Princess Mary and her dowry might be given up to them at once, or sent over as early as possible in anticipation of the time appointed by the treaty. The first point Wolsey was willing to concede, if assured of sufficient co-operation from Flanders; but the conditions he required were declared by the Flemings to be quite impossible in the exhausted condition of the country. The second demand looked strange enough, and Wolsey asked what adequate hostages they could give for a young Princess who was the treasure of the kingdom. Would they meanwhile put some of their fortified towns into the King's hands? This, too, the ambassadors said, could not be thought of; and the embassy had made little progress when, on March 9, the news from Pavia reached London. The King professed delight at the Emperor's victory; bonfires were lighted, wine flowed freely for everyone in the streets, and on Sunday the 12th a solemn mass was celebrated by Wolsey at St Paul's.

The Cardinal then, at the request of the Flemings, dismissed Brinon and Passano, and strongly urged that now was the time for both allies to put forth all their strength. They might completely conquer France between them, and Henry, meeting the Emperor in Paris, would accompany him to Rome for his coronation. The scheme, of course, was preposterous; but the proposal of it to the Emperor by the English ambassadors in Spain wrung from him the confession that he had no money to carry on the war, with other admissions besides, which proved clearly that he was really seeking to break off his engagement to the Princess Mary, and was bent on a more advantageous match with Isabella of Portugal. Thus England was to obtain nothing in return for all her loans to the Emperor; but the Emperor, as it soon appeared,

meant to make his own terms with his prisoner, and keep to himself entirely the profits of a joint war; in which, indeed, English aid had profited him little.

Meanwhile the victory at Pavia was declared in England to be a great opportunity for the King to recover his rights in France by conducting a new invasion; in aid of which commissions were issued to levy further contributions, called an "Amicable Grant," though some instalments of the parliamentary subsidy had still to be received. As commissioner for the City of London, Wolsey called the Lord Mayor and Aldermen before him, telling them that he and the Archbishop of Canterbury had each given a third part of their revenues, and urging that persons of over £50 income might well contribute a sixth of their goods according to their own valuation made in 1522. At this there was very natural discontent, the more so as many had incurred serious losses since that date; but the matter was pressed both in London and in the country. The demand was generally resisted. At Reading the people would only give a twelfth. In Suffolk the Duke of Suffolk persuaded them to give a sixth; but the clothiers said it would compel them to discharge their men, and a serious rising took place. At last, instead of a forced demand, Wolsey persuaded the King to be content with a voluntary "benevolence." But a new objection was raised that benevolences were illegal by an Act of Richard III; and ultimately the King had to give up the demand altogether, and to pardon the insurgents.

Wolsey told the citizens that the demand was abandoned because the French King's capture had disposed him to make suit to England for an honourable peace; for if the King had not crossed the sea (he alleged) the money would have been returned, and now it would probably not be required. But until peace was actually concluded, they must still hold themselves prepared to make further sacrifices. Thus did Wolsey smooth the way for a policy of peace with France, which he was now actively pursuing. Passano, who had not ceased to hold indirect communication with him, again appeared in London in June, no longer as a secret agent, but as an accredited ambassador from Louise of Savoy, now ennobled with the title of the Seigneur de Vaulx. He concluded with Wolsey a forty days' truce; but the Flemings immediately concluded one for five months with France, and the truce concluded by de Vaulx was prolonged to December 1 by Brinon, who soon followed him again to England with a commission to both for a more lasting treaty. The terms required by Wolsey were hard; but demands made at first for a cession of Ardres or Boulogne were given up, and the old payments exacted from France were increased to a capital sum of 2,000,000 crowns payable at the rate of 100,000 crowns a year. After long discussions with Wolsey, a set of five treaties was signed at his palace of the Moor in Hertfordshire on August 30, the most important being a league for

mutual defence, in which Henry bound himself to use his influence with the Emperor to induce him to set Francis at liberty on reasonable conditions. At the request of the Frenchmen peace was proclaimed a week later (September 6).

The Pope, the Venetians, and other Italian Powers who dreaded the overwhelming ascendancy of the Emperor, were glad of this arrangement between France and England. But it had little effect on the Emperor's conduct towards his prisoner, who by this time had been conveyed to Madrid. His sister Margaret, Duchess of Alençon, came to Spain to treat for his liberation; but the conditions demanded by the Emperor were such as she had no power to grant. The chief difficulty concerned the cession of Burgundy. But Francis fell dangerously ill, and on his recovery he agreed to concede even this for the sake of liberty. On January 14, 1526, he signed the Treaty of Madrid, with all its onerous terms, including, among other things, the promise to refund the sum of 500,000 crowns due from the Emperor to Henry.

England had been unable to do anything to mitigate the severity of the conditions. Henry, indeed, had sent a new ambassador, Dr Edward Lee, to Spain with that object; but it was easy to prevent either him or his colleagues from effectually interfering with the negotiations. After the treaty was signed, however, Francis told them that he was grateful to Henry above all princes living for not having invaded France, and that Henry should know his secret mind upon some things as soon as he had returned to his realm. What he meant by this we may imagine from the sequel.

The preponderance in Europe which seemed to be secured to Charles by the Treaty of Madrid alarmed not only the King of England. It was generally believed, however, that Francis on regaining his liberty, neither would nor could allow himself to be bound by provisions to which he had no right to assent without consulting the Estates of his realm and the duchy of Burgundy. The Italian Powers accordingly looked anxiously to Francis, and, on account of Francis, not less anxiously to Henry.

England was strong, and even stronger than she had been. The only active pretender to Henry's throne, Richard de la Pole, self-styled Duke of Suffolk, "White Rose" as his followers called him, had been slain at the battle of Pavia fighting for Francis. Moreover the Duke of Albany had left Scotland for the last time (he accompanied Francis to Italy and, but for the event of Pavia, would have gone on to Naples); so that the French party in Scotland was overpowered, and though there were changes enough in that country none of them were injurious to English interests. Henry was powerful, and no prince was held in higher esteem. Special gifts had been conferred upon him by three successive Popes,—a golden rose by Julius II, a sword and cap by Leo X (besides the title of Defender of the Faith), and another

golden rose by Clement VII. He was also still highly popular at home; for his subjects did not impute their heavy taxation to him. One thing indeed he did at this time, which was disagreeable to his own Queen. He had a bastard son six years old, whom in June, 1525, he created Duke of Richmond, assigning him at the same time a special household and lands as if for a legitimate Prince. But this, apparently, did not greatly abate his popularity; and it seems to have been partly to conciliate public opinion that Wolsey, in that year, handed over to the King the magnificent palace he had built at Hampton Court as too grand to belong to a subject

It was on March 17, 1526, that Francis was released and reached Bayonne. That same day he took the English Ambassador Tayler in his arms, expressing warm gratitude to Henry, and soon after he dispatched de Vaulx once more to England with his ratifications of the Treaties of the Moor. On May 22, after Francis had reached Cognac, ambassadors of the Pope, the Venetians, and the Duke of Milan made an alliance with the French King against the Emperor.

Henry, who had confirmed his own treaty with Francis at Greenwich on April 29, was not a party to this League of Cognac; but he was strongly solicited to join it by the Italian Powers. Indeed, a special place was reserved for him in the treaty itself as Protector and Conservator of the alliance if he chose to join it, with a principality in Naples as an additional attraction. But he and Wolsey only dallied with the confederates, insisting on various modifications of the treaty, while the others were already committed to hostilities in Italy. Meanwhile the confederacy moved on to its ruin, which was completed at the Sack of Rome.

Francis naturally desired to obtain from the Emperor the best terms he could for redeeming his sons. Wolsey, however, had from the first endeavoured to keep him from any kind of agreement, assuring him that he was in no wise bound by the Treaty of Madrid, and hinting that a match with the Princess Mary would be more suitable for him than one with the Emperor's sister Eleanor, whom by that treaty he had engaged to marry And though the bait did not take immediately—for Francis, as his own ministers said, was ready to marry the Emperor's mule to recover his sons—the Emperor still insisted on such intolerable conditions that Francis at last desired an offensive alliance with England by which he might either dictate terms or redeem his sons by war. An embassy with this view headed by de Grammont, Bishop of Tarbes, came to England in February, 1527. The ambassadors were long in negotiation with Wolsey, who insisted first on a new treaty of perpetual peace, with a heavy tribute from France, and after all his demands were conceded coolly told them that, if the Emperor would not release the Princes without Francis marrying Eleanor, the King recommended him to do so. Three treaties were at last signed on April 30, and, after the Bishop of

Tarbes had gone back to France and returned again, another was concluded on May 29, for maintaining a joint army in Italy. But there were still matters to be settled, for which Henry desired a personal interview with Francis. This the French did not favour, but said that Wolsey would be welcome in France as his master's representative; and Francis himself wrote that he would go to Picardy to meet him.

The King is said to have alleged later,—though there is no sufficient proof of the truth of the story,—that, during this embassy the Bishop of Tarbes had expressed a doubt concerning the Princess Mary's legitimacy, as her mother Catharine had been the wife of Prince Arthur, her father's brother. It was the King himself who was now contemplating a divorce on this plea, although no one yet knew it. As a first step, in May he allowed himself to be cited in private before Wolsey as Legate and called upon to justify his marriage. Nothing came of this proceeding, except that on June 22 Henry shocked his wife by telling her that they must part company, as he found by the opinion of divines and lawyers that they had been living in sin. He desired her, however, to keep the matter secret for the present; and Wolsey, on his way to France, persuaded both Archbishop Warham and Bishop Fisher that the King was only trying to answer objections raised by the Bishop of Tarbes.

Wolsey himself, however, did not know all the King's mind upon the subject when, after landing at Calais in July, he proceeded through France with a more magnificent train than ever, not as ambassador but as his King's lieutenant, to a meeting with Francis at Amiens. On this matter he believed he was commissioned, not only to hint that Catharine would be divorced, but also to put forward a project for marrying the King to Renée, daughter of Louis XII. This would, of course, have knit firmer the bond between Henry and Francis against the Emperor, who was Catharine's nephew. But in France he was instructed to keep back "the King's secret matter," or only to intimate it very vaguely; and during the whole of his stay there, which extended to two months and a half, he did not venture to say anything definite upon the subject.

Another matter, however, helped to strengthen the case for a union against the Emperor. A month before Wolsey crossed the Channel, news had reached England that Rome had been sacked, and the Pope shut up in the Castle of St Angelo. At Canterbury Wolsey ordered a litany to be sung for the imprisoned Pope, but considered how he could best utilise the incident for the King's advantage. At Amiens on August 18, three new treaties were made, which Henry and Francis ratified forthwith; and among other things it was settled that Mary should be married to the Duke of Orleans instead of to Francis, and that no brief or Bull should be received during the Pope's imprisonment, but that whatever should be determined by the clergy of England and France in the meantime should be valid. It was also agreed what terms should be demanded

of the Emperor by the two Kings; and meanwhile an English detachment under Sir Robert Jerningham was sent to join the French commander Lautrec in an Italian expedition for the Pope's delivery.

Before Wolsey returned from France he had made the discovery that the King's real object in seeking a divorce had not been imparted to him, and that Henry was pursuing it independently. It was not a French princess whom Henry designed to place in Catharine's room, but one Anne Boleyn, daughter of Sir Thomas Boleyn, a simple knight, who had only been created a viscount (by the title of Rochford) in 1525. The elder sister of this lady had already been seduced by the King, but she herself had resisted till she was assured of the Crown, and Henry persuaded himself that all that was required for his marriage with Anne Boleyn was a dispensation for a case of near affinity created by illicit intercourse with her sister. For he did not, in this first phase of the question, maintain, as he afterwards did, that cases like that of Catharine could not be dispensed for at all. He maintained that the dispensation procured for his marriage with Catharine was technically insufficient, and that the marriage was consequently *ipso facto* invalid.

He accordingly, while Wolsey was still in France, dispatched Dr Knight, his secretary, to Italy on pretences that did not satisfy the Cardinal; and Knight performed his mission with great dexterity according to his instructions. He arrived at Rome while the Pope was still in confinement, and though it was hopeless to procure an interview, found means to convey to him the draft dispensation desired by the King, and obtained a promise that it should be passed when he was at liberty. Not long after the Pope escaped to Orvieto, where Knight obtained from him, in effect, a document such as he was instructed to ask for. But unfortunately it was absolutely useless for the King's purpose until he should be declared free of his first marriage; and Knight's mission had no effect except to open the eyes of the Pope and Cardinals to Henry's real object.

Meanwhile, France and England having become the closest possible allies, the two sovereigns elected each other into their respective Orders of St Michael and the Garter; and their heralds Guienne and Clarencieux jointly declared war upon the Emperor at Burgos on January 22, 1528. On this the English merchants in Spain were arrested, and it was rumoured that the heralds were arrested also; in return for which Wolsey actually imprisoned for a time the Imperial Ambassador Mendoza. This war was extremely unpopular in England. A French alliance, indeed, was generally hateful, especially against the Emperor, who was regarded as a natural ally. The mart for English wools was removed from Antwerp to Calais; trade was interrupted both with the Low Countries and Spain; and this, added to the effect of bad harvests at home, produced severe distress. Cloth lay on the merchants' hands unsaleable, and the clothiers of the Eastern Counties were obliged to discharge their spinners, carders,

and "tuckers." The state of matters became, in fact, intolerable, and a commercial truce was arranged with Flanders from the beginning of May to the end of February following.

The expedition of Lautrec and Jerningham in Italy, very successful in the spring, proved completely disastrous in the following summer. Plague carried off the two commanders, and the defection of Andrea Doria completed the ruin of the allied forces.

After Knight's failure Wolsey addressed himself to the real difficulty in attaining the King's object, and dispatched his secretary Stephen Gardiner with Edward Foxe to persuade the Pope to send a Legate commissioned jointly with Wolsey to try in England the question whether the dispensation to marry Catharine was sufficient. The commission desired was a decretal one, setting forth the law by which judgment should proceed, and leaving the judges to ascertain the facts and pass judgment without appeal. This was resisted as unusual, and the ambassadors were obliged to be satisfied with a general commission, which Foxe took home to England, believing it to be equally efficacious. His report seems to have convinced the King and Anne Boleyn that their object was as good as gained. But Wolsey saw that the commission was insufficient, and he instructed Gardiner to press again by every possible means for a decretal commission, even though it should be secret and not to be employed in the process; otherwise his power over Henry was gone and utter ruin hung over him as having deceived the King about the Pope's willingness to oblige him. Urged in this way, the Pope with very great reluctance gave for Wolsey's sake precisely what was asked for—a secret decretal commission, not to be used in the process, but only to be shown to the King and Wolsey, and then to be destroyed. He also gave a secret promise in writing not to revoke the commission which was not to be used. This secret commission was entrusted to Campeggio, the legate sent to England as Wolsey's colleague to try the cause, with strict injunctions not to let it go out of his hands.

Campeggio suffered severely from gout, and his progress to England was slow and tedious. He reached London on October 7, prostrated by illness; but he had the full command of the business, and Wolsey found, to his dismay, that he had no means of taking it out of his hands. Moreover, Campeggio had promised the Pope before leaving not to give sentence without reference to him. He tried first to dissuade the King from the trial; then to induce the Queen to accept an honourable release by entering a convent. Both attempts he found hopeless. The Queen was as determined as the King, and was supported by general sympathy out of doors, the women, particularly, cheering her wherever she went.

On November 8 the King declared to the Lord Mayor and Aldermen at Bridewell the reasons for his conduct, imputing, as before, to the French ambassadors the first doubts of his marriage. But before matters had come to a trial Catharine showed Campeggio a document

which seemed to make the validity of the marriage unimpeachable. It was a copy of a brief preserved in Spain, by which Julius II had given, at the earnest request of Queen Isabella, a full dispensation for the marriage, assuming that the previous marriage with Arthur had really been consummated. The King and Wolsey were seriously perplexed. They put forth reasons for believing the brief to be a forgery, and urged the Queen herself, as if in her own interest, to write to the Emperor to send it to England. The object, however, was too plain; and though, under positive compulsion, she did write as requested, her messenger, as soon as he reached Spain, took care to inform the Emperor that she had written against her will.

The King was now living under one roof with Anne Boleyn, having given her a fine suite of apartments next to his own at Greenwich, and was quite infatuated in his passion, only awaiting an authoritative pronouncement that should allow him to marry. Early in February, 1529, his prospects seemed to be changed by a false report of the death of Clement VII; but the Pope, after being really very ill, recovered slowly in the spring, and was no sooner again fit for business than he was pestered by English agents with demands to declare the brief in Spain a forgery. The attempt to discredit the brief, however, was at last abandoned; and the King and Wolsey determined to commence the trial and push it on as fast as possible, for fear of some arrest of the proceedings. Good reasons had already been given at Rome by the Imperial ambassador for revocation of the cause; but the Pope declined to interfere with the hearing before the Legates.

The Court was formally opened accordingly at Blackfriars on May 31, when citations were issued to the King and Queen to appear on June 18. On that day the Queen appeared in person before the Legates, and objected to their jurisdiction. This objection being considered, on the 21st the Legates pronounced themselves to be competent judges; whereupon the Queen intimated an appeal to the Pope and withdrew, after some touching words addressed to the King in Court. Being called again and refusing to return, she was pronounced contumacious, and the trial went on. But an incident at the fifth sitting, which was on the 28th, astonished everyone. John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester—a lover of books, who commonly avoided public life—said that the King at a former sitting had professed justice to be his only aim, and had invited everyone who could throw light upon the subject to relieve his scruples. He therefore felt bound in duty to show the conclusion which he had reached after two years' careful study; which was that the marriage was indissoluble by any authority, divine or human, and he presented a book which he had composed on the subject. He was followed by Standish, Bishop of St Asaph, and Dr Ligham, Dean of the Arches, who maintained the same view.

The Legates remonstrated, rather mildly, that Fisher was pronouncing

in a cause which was not committed to him; and the King composed, but probably did not deliver, a very angry speech in reply addressed to the judges. The Court went on, taking evidence chiefly about the circumstances of Prince Arthur's marriage, till July 23, when Campeggio prorogued it to October 1. Shortly afterwards arrived an intimation that the cause was "advoked" to Rome and all further proceedings must be prosecuted there. This the Imperialists had procured on the Queen's demand for justice, which the Pope could not resist, and Henry saw that it was a death-blow to his expectations.

The fall of Wolsey was now inevitable. From the first the business of the divorce had been a source of intense anxiety to him, knowing as he did that, if he failed to give the King satisfaction, his ruin would be easily achieved by the leading lords who had been so long excluded from the King's counsels. And now that the failure was complete he was visibly out of favour. But the King was too well aware of his value not to desire his advice about many things, even now; and there was one matter in particular in which his guiding hand had scarcely completed his work. The King, indeed, had intended to send him to Cambray to assist in a European settlement if the trial could have been got over soon enough; but Bishop Tunstall and Sir Thomas More were sent in his place. By the Treaty of Cambray, signed on August 5, the state of war between Francis and the Emperor was ended, the conditions of the Treaty of Madrid were at length modified, and Francis was permitted to redeem his sons without parting with Burgundy. It was undoubtedly the Emperor's fear of England that secured these favourable conditions for France, and France had in return to take upon herself all the Emperor's liabilities to Henry. The English also made their own separate treaties at Cambray both with the Emperor and with Francis.

But through the influence of Anne Boleyn Wolsey was presently excluded from the King's presence, and ultimately he found himself cut off from all communication with his sovereign. On October 9, the first day of Michaelmas term, he took his seat as Chancellor for the last time in Westminster Hall. That day an indictment was preferred against him in the King's Bench, and the 30th of the same month was appointed for his trial. But meanwhile he was made to surrender the Great Seal and to execute a curious deed, in which he confessed the *praemunire* of which he was afterwards found guilty, and desired the King to take all his land and property in part compensation for his offences. This he did, not because the *praemunire* was just, but only in the hope of avoiding a parliamentary impeachment; which nevertheless was brought forward in the House of Lords, but was thrown out in the Commons by the exertions of his dependent, Thomas Cromwell.

For a new Parliament had been called, after an interval of six years, and the session had been opened by Sir Thomas More, who had just been appointed Lord Chancellor in Wolsey's place. The elections had

been unduly influenced, and the Commons were so subservient that one of their Acts was expressly to release the King from repayment of the forced loan—for which, as may be imagined, they incurred general ill-will. They also sent up a host of bills to the Lords, attacking abuses connected with probates, mortuaries, and other matters of spiritual jurisdiction, and also against clerical pluralities, and non-residence. Bishop Fisher thought it right to protest in the House of Lords against the spirit and tendency of such legislation; and because he had pointed to the example of Bohemia as a kingdom ruined by lack of faith, the Speaker and thirty of the Commons were deputed to complain to the King that Fisher seemed to regard them as no better than Turks and infidels. It may be suspected that they were prompted; for Henry was certainly glad of the opportunity of calling on the Bishop to explain himself.

On the breaking up of the Legatine Court the King had been just about to give up further pursuit of a divorce as hopeless; and in that belief he had sought to get the cause superseded at Rome that he might not be summoned out of his own realm. But in August, when he visited Waltham Abbey in a progress, he was told of a suggestion made by one Thomas Cranmer, a private tutor who had been there just before (having been driven from Cambridge by an epidemic), that he might still get warrant enough for treating his marriage as invalid by procuring a number of opinions to that effect from English and foreign universities. He at once caught at the idea, and relied on the friendship of Francis to procure what he wanted on the other side of the Channel.

In the beginning of the year 1530, when the Emperor had gone to Bologna to be crowned by the Pope, Anne Boleyn's father, who had recently been created Earl of Wiltshire, and Dr Stokesley, Bishop elect of London, were sent thither with a commission to treat for a universal peace and a general alliance against the Turk. That was the pretext; and no doubt aid against the Turks would then have been particularly valuable to the Emperor, seeing that they had got fast hold of Hungary, and had quite recently besieged Vienna. But the main object was to explain to Charles with great show of cordiality, now that the two sovereigns were friends again, the manifold arguments against the validity of Henry's marriage with his aunt. And with this purpose in view, Stokesley on his way through France strove to quicken the process of getting opinions from French universities. The decisions even of the English universities were only obtained in March and April, under what pressure it is needless to say. The mere purpose of the proceedings raised the indignation of the women of Oxford, who pelted with stones Bishop Longland, the Chancellor, and his companion, when they came to obtain the seal of the University. No wonder, therefore, that when Wiltshire arrived at Bologna in March no French university had been induced to pronounce a judgment. His mission, in truth was anything

but a success, and it is hard to see that much could have been expected of it. For the Pope, just before his coming, had issued a Bull, dated March 7, committing the King's cause to Capisucchi, Auditor of the Rota; which after his arrival was followed by another on the 21st, forbidding all ecclesiastical judges or lawyers from speaking or writing against the validity of the marriage. Worse still, Wiltshire's presence gave opportunity to serve him, as Henry's representative, with a summons for his master to appear in person or by deputy before the tribunal at Rome. The Pope, however, offered to suspend the cause till September, if Henry would take no further step till then; and the King accepted the offer.

Wolsey, meanwhile, had been living at Esher, in a house belonging to him as Bishop of Winchester, whither on his disgrace he was ordered to withdraw. But his enemies, fearing lest the King should again employ his services, were anxious that he should be sent to his other and more remote northern diocese; and an arrangement was made in February, 1530, by which he received a general pardon, resigning to the King for a sum of ready money the bishopric of Winchester and the Abbey of St Alban's, while the possessions of his archbishopric of York were restored to him. He began his journey north early in Lent, paused at Peterborough over Easter, and spent the summer at Southwell, a seat of the Archbishops of York, where he was intensely mortified to learn that the King had determined to dissolve two Colleges, the one at Ipswich and the other at Oxford, of which he had brought about the establishment with great labour and cost. For this object, as early as 1524, he had procured Bulls to dissolve certain small monasteries and apply their revenues to his new foundations; and the obloquy he had incurred from other causes was certainly increased by the dissolution of those Houses. Indeed in 1525 a riot took place at Bayham in Sussex, where a company in disguise restored, though only for a few days, the extruded Canons. The Ipswich College was suppressed by the King. At Oxford, however, the buildings had advanced too far to be stopped and the work was completed on a less magnificent design. After Wolsey's death the King called it "King Henry VIII's College." It is now known as Christ Church.

In the autumn Wolsey moved further north, and, reaching Cawood by the beginning of November, at length hoped to be installed in his own Cathedral of York on the 7th. But on the 4th he was visited by the Earl of Northumberland, who suddenly notified to him his arrest on a charge of treason. His Italian physician Agostini had been bribed by the Duke of Norfolk to betray secret communications which he had held with the French Ambassador de Vaulx, and the charge was added that he had urged the Pope to excommunicate the King and so cause an insurrection. Unconscious of this, he was conducted to Sheffield, where, at the Earl of Shrewsbury's house, he was alarmed to learn that Sir

William Kingston had been dispatched to bring him up to London. As Sir William was Constable of the Tower, Wolsey now perceived that his execution was intended; and sheer terror brought on an illness, of which he died on the way at Leicester.

So passed away the great Cardinal, the animating spirit of whose whole career is expressed in the sad words he uttered at the last, that if he had served God as diligently as he had served the King, He would not have given him over in his grey hairs. Conspicuous beyond all other victims of royal ingratitude, he had strained every nerve to make his sovereign great, wealthy, and powerful. His devotion to the King had undoubtedly interfered with his spiritual duties as a Churchman; it was not until his fall that he was able to give any care to his episcopal function. The new career, so soon terminated, showed another and a more amiable side in his character. That he might have been happy if unmolested, even when stripped of power, there is little reason to doubt. Yet his was a soul that loved grandeur and display, magnificent in building and in schemes for education; he was ambitious, no doubt, and it might be high-handed, as the agent of a despotic master, but with nothing mean or sordid in his character. And something of ambition might surely be condoned in one whose favour the greatest princes of Europe were eager to secure. For with a penetrating glance he saw through all their different aims and devices. The glamour of external greatness never imposed upon him; and, whatever bribes or tributes might be offered to himself, his splendid political abilities were devoted with single-minded aim to the service of his King and country. He raised England from the rank of a second-rate Power among the nations. His faults, indeed, are not to be denied. Impure as a priest and unscrupulous in many ways as a statesman, he was only a conspicuous example in these things of a prevailing moral corruption. But his great public services, fruitful in their consequences even under the perverse influences which succeeded him, would have produced yet nobler results for his country, if his policy had been left without interference.

Meanwhile, the King had fallen on a new device to force the Pope's hand. A meeting of notable persons was called on June 12, to draw up a joint address to his Holiness, urging him to decide the cause in Henry's favour, lest they should be driven to take the matter into their own hands. To obtain subscriptions to this the nobles were separately dealt with, and the document was sent down into the country to obtain the signatures and seals of peers and prelates, among others of Wolsey at Southwell. It was finally dispatched on July 13; and Clement, though he might well have felt indignant at this attempt to influence his judicial decision by threats, made on September 27 a remarkably temperate reply. He had, moreover, a few months before, sent to England a Nuncio named Nicholas del Burgo to smooth matters; and the prospect of justice to Catharine was not improved by this perpetual dallying.

Bishop Fisher, however, was most assiduous in writing books to support her cause—so much so that Archbishop Warham, awed by the King's authority, called him to his house one day, and earnestly, but in vain, besought him to retract.

Nevertheless inhibitions came from Rome which, it was believed, made the King at one time really think of putting away Anne Boleyn. This was at the beginning of the year 1531. But he recovered heart when repeated briefs seemed only to grow weaker; and, conscious of his power at home, he sought to attain his object by breaking down the independence of the clergy, from the whole body of whom he contrived to extort, not only a heavy fine for a *praemunire* which they were held to have incurred by submitting to the legatine jurisdiction of Wolsey, but also an acknowledgment of his being "Supreme Head" of the Church of England. This title was only conceded to him by the Convocation of Canterbury after a three days' debate, when it was carried at last by an artifice, and with the modifying words "so far as the law of Christ allows." Nor was it without protest that the northern clergy were brought to the same acknowledgment. This encroachment on their liberties made the clergy of the south regret their pecuniary grant; but they were altogether helpless, though in the end of August their assessment led to a riotous attack on the Bishop of London's palace at St Paul's.

Parliament had met on January 15, and was kept sitting into March without doing anything material. All the members were anxious to go home, and the Queen's friends easily got leave. On March 30 it was prorogued for Easter, when Sir Thomas More as Chancellor, though utterly sick of an office which he had unwillingly accepted even with the assurance that his own convictions would be respected, found himself obliged to declare to the Commons, in order that they might check ill reports in the country, the conscientious motives by which the King said he had been induced to seek a divorce, and the opinions obtained in his favour from the greatest universities in Christendom. What effect this had in allaying popular indignation at the King's proceedings is very doubtful. A strange occurrence in February in Bishop Fisher's household had produced a most unpleasant impression. A number of the servants fell ill, and two of them died. It was found that the cook had put poison in some pottage, of which happily the Bishop himself had not tasted; but it was generally believed his life had been aimed at by Anne Boleyn's friends. The King, however, was very angry; and, to avert suspicion, caused the Parliament to pass an *ex post facto* law, which was at once put in force, visiting the crime of poisoning with the hideous penalty of being boiled alive.

At Rome the cause hardly made any progress. Henry in fact, though he would not appear there, either personally or by proxy, employed agents to delay it, especially a lawyer named Sir Edward Carne, called

his *excusator*, who, without showing any commission from him, argued that he should not be summoned out of his realm. In his protest to that effect Henry had the support of Francis I, who urged that the cause might at least be tried at Cambray, and procured a decision for the King from the University of Orleans that he could not be compelled to appear at Rome. And though the process actually began in June, it was soon suspended for the Roman holidays from July to October, when the *excusator* at length produced a commission, and the question about giving him a hearing next occupied the Court. In November this was refused until he should produce a power from the King to stand to the trial; but he managed afterwards to get the question further discussed, and, in point of fact, the whole of the following year was wasted before the principal cause was reached.

Meanwhile, Catharine suffered more and more from the delay of justice. On May 31 she had to endure a conference with about thirty of the leading peers, accompanied by Bishops Stokesley and Longland and other clergymen, who were sent by the King to remonstrate with her on the scandal she had caused by his being cited to Rome. In July she was ordered to remain at Windsor while the King went about hunting with Anne Boleyn; and, when the Queen sent a message after him regretting that he had not bid her farewell, he sent her word in reply that he was offended with her on account of the citation. After that they never met again. She was ordered to withdraw to the Moor in Hertfordshire, and afterwards to Easthampstead. But even then she was not free from deputations; for another came to her at the Moor in October, to urge her once more to allow her cause to be decided in England. But it was in vain they plied her with arguments, which she answered with equal gentleness and firmness. As she came to understand the King's mind, she was more resolved than ever to have her cause decided at Rome.

And Rome was at last really moved in her behalf. Slow as he was to take action, Clement was compelled, on January 25, 1532, to send the King a brief of reproof for his desertion of Catharine and cohabitation with Anne Boleyn. But Henry induced the Parliament, now assembled for a new session, to pass a bill,—which he told the Nuncio was passed against his will by the Commons out of their great hatred to the Pope—for abolishing the payment of First-fruits to Rome. This Act, however, it was left in the King's power to suspend till the Pope met his wishes; and how little the Commons acted spontaneously in such matters may be seen by what speedily followed. On March 18 the Speaker and a deputation of that body waited on the King to complain of a number of grievances to which the laity were subjected by "the Prelates and Ordinaries," and which they desired the King would remedy. But with this petition they at the same time begged for a dissolution of Parliament, considering the excessive cost they had sustained by long attendance.

The King replied that their second request was inconsistent with their first. They must wait for the answer of the Ordinaries to their complaints, and meanwhile he desired their assent to a very unpopular bill about wardships, which he had persuaded the Lords to pass. But he could not get the Commons to agree to it.

Parliament was prorogued for ten days at Easter. On Easter Day (March 31), William Peto, Provincial of the Grey Friars, preached before the King at Greenwich a sermon in which he pointed out how Kings were encouraged in evil by false counsellors. After the sermon, being called to a private interview, Peto further warned the King that he was endangering his Crown, as both small and great disapproved of his designs. The King dissembled his ill-will and licensed Peto to leave the kingdom on his duties; after which he caused Dr Richard Curwen, a chaplain of his own, to preach in the same place a sermon of an opposite tenor. In this Curwen not only contradicted what Peto had said in the pulpit, but added that he wished Peto were there to answer him; on which the Warden of the convent, Henry Elstowe, at once answered him in Peto's place. Peto was then recalled by the King, who asked him to deprive the Warden; but he refused, and both he and Elstowe were committed to prison.

When Parliament met again in April the Commons were solicited for aid in the fortification of the Scotch frontier. They objected to the expense; and two members said boldly that the Borders were secure enough, if the King would only take back his Queen and live in peace with the Emperor; for without foreign aid the Scots could do no harm. On the 30th the King sent for the Speaker and others of the Commons, and delivered to them the answer of the Ordinaries to their complaints, which he said he did not think would satisfy them, but he would leave them to consider it, and would himself be an indifferent judge between them. In such strange fashion did he declare his impartiality. On May 11 he sent for them again, and said that he had discovered that the clergy were but half his subjects, since the Bishops at their consecration took an oath at variance with the one they took to him. After some references to and fro the final result was the famous "Submission of the Clergy" agreed to on May 15, and presented to the King at Westminster on the following day. Hereby they agreed to enact no new ordinances without royal licence and to submit to a Committee of sixteen persons, one half laymen and one half clerics, the question as to what ordinances should be annulled as inconsistent with God's laws and those of the realm.

On that same day Sir Thomas More, who had done his best to prevent these innovations, surrendered his office of Chancellor, from which he had long sought in vain to be released. To fill his place in some respects, Thomas Audeley, the Speaker, was at first appointed Keeper of the Great Seal, but in the following January received the full title and office of Lord Chancellor.

Henry's way was now tolerably clear, and on June 23, 1532, he made a secret alliance with Francis I for mutual aid against the Emperor when it should be required. Francis for his part delighted in the belief that to gratify an insane passion Henry had put himself completely in his hands. Henry, however, was really using him to ward off excommunication; which, if pronounced, Francis informed the Pope he would resent as deeply as Henry himself. And, to give greater effect to the threat, Henry persuaded him to an interview, the only professed object of which —the concerting of measures against the Turk—was not only seen to be a pretence, but was meant to be seen through. It took place in October between Calais and Boulogne, with much less pomp than the Field of Cloth of Gold twelve years before. But the various meetings lasted over a week, and made an effective demonstration; and to counteract this the Emperor arranged a meeting with the Pope, which took place at Bologna in December. Anne Boleyn, of course, crossed with Henry to the meetings with Francis, who was found ready to dance with her. She had been created Marchioness of Pembroke on September 1, and Imperialists were relieved to find that Henry had not yet married her. Clement was compelled to warn the King by another brief on November 15 to put her away on pain of excommunication.

Towards the close of the year the Earl of Northumberland invaded the Scotch border, and a state of war continued between the two countries for some months, but led to no great results.

Another event favoured Henry's aims. Archbishop Warham, who had striven hard to maintain the old privileges of the clergy, died in August. Henry at once proposed to name as his successor Thomas Cranmer, who had been so useful in suggesting the appeal to the universities. He had lately sent him as ambassador to the Emperor with secret messages to the German Princes to gain their alliance against their sovereign. This intrigue was ineffectual, but he accompanied the Emperor to Vienna, and then to Mantua, where in November he received his recall with a view to his approaching elevation. In February, 1533, bulls for his promotion were demanded of the Pope, who was then still at Bologna in frequent conference with the Emperor, and were obtained free of payment of First-fruits by the suggestion that the King, if favourably dealt with, had it in his power to cancel the Act against First-fruits generally.

But before this, on January 25, Henry had secretly married Anne Boleyn, and, knowing her to be with child, was preparing to have her openly proclaimed as Queen. To guard against consequences, however, he first obtained from Convocation opinions against the Pope's dispensing power in cases similar to that of Catharine, and then from Parliament an Act making appeals to Rome high treason. On Easter Eve, April 12, Anne went to mass in great state and was publicly named Queen. No sentence had yet been given by any Court to release the King from his

marriage with Catharine; but on Good Friday the new Archbishop wrote to him (of course by desire) a very humble request that he would allow him to determine that weighty cause which had remained so long undecided. The King willingly gave him a commission to try it; and the Archbishop cited him and Catharine to appear before him at Dunstable—a place carefully selected as being conveniently out of the way. There, on May 23, sentence was given of the nullity of the King's first marriage; and five days later at Lambeth a very secret enquiry was held before Thomas Cromwell and others as to the validity of the King's marriage with Anne Boleyn. Of course it was pronounced valid, though the very date of the event was uncertain, and all the details were kept a profound secret. Anne was crowned at Westminster on Whitsunday, June 1, with all due state, but with no appearance of popular enthusiasm. Then another deputation was sent to Catharine, now at Ampthill, to inform her that she was no longer Queen and must henceforth bear the name of Princess Dowager; but she refused to submit to such a degradation.

Sentence of excommunication was pronounced against Henry at Rome on July 11; but even now he was allowed until the end of September to set himself right, before the sentence should be declared openly, by taking back his wife and putting away Anne Boleyn. This troubled his ally Francis more than himself; for the Pope was coming to France for an interview at which he hoped to make Henry's peace. This interview, indeed, had been planned with Henry's own approval, the policy then being to make the Pope feel that he must look to France and England to save him from the necessity of holding a General Council at the Emperor's bidding. But Henry now completely changed his tone and endeavoured to dissuade Francis from meeting the Pope at all;—which, however, Francis was bent on doing, in order to arrange the marriage, which afterwards took place, of his son Henry, Duke of Orleans, with the Pope's niece, Catharine de' Medici. He met the Pope at Marseilles in October; but, while they were both there still in November, Dr Edmund Bonner, a skilful agent of the King, who had followed Clement from Rome, intimated to his Holiness an appeal on Henry's behalf to the next General Council against the sentence of excommunication. Next month the King's Council at home came to a resolution that the Pope should henceforth be designated merely "Bishop of Rome"; and during the following year written acknowledgments were extorted from Bishops, abbeys, priories, and parochial clergy all over the kingdom that the Roman pontiff had no more authority than any foreign Bishop.

The policy which the King had now been pursuing for four successive years had been inspired by Thomas Cromwell, who, as we have seen, had been in Wolsey's service. He was a man of humble origin, who, after a roving youth spent in Italy and elsewhere, had risen by the use of his wits, and since his master's fall had now been for three years a Privy

Councillor. In 1534 he was made the King's chief secretary, and a few months later Master of the Rolls. But even in August, 1533, he had directed Cranmer as Archbishop to examine one Elizabeth Barton, commonly called the Nun of Canterbury, or the Holy Maid of Kent, who had long professed to have visions and trances. Afterwards he examined her himself, and committed her and a number of her friends to prison. She had uttered fearful warnings to the King in the case of his marrying Anne Boleyn; and efforts were made to prove that she had been encouraged by Catharine's friends. It was even sought to implicate Catharine herself, but no case could be made out against her. The charge was more plausible against Bishop Fisher, who had certainly communicated with her in previous years, but only in order to test her pretensions, which found wide credit, even with people of high standing. His name, and at first that of Sir Thomas More likewise, were included in a bill of attainder against the Nun's adherents; but Sir Thomas entirely cleared himself, and the charge against the Bishop amounted only to misprision Ultimately the Nun and six others were attainted of treason and afterwards executed at Tyburn, while the Bishop and five more were found guilty of misprision of treason, and were sentenced to forfeiture of goods.

On March 23, 1534, the Pope pronounced Henry's marriage with Catharine valid, while Parliament in England was passing an Act of Succession in favour of Anne Boleyn's issue. Her daughter, Elizabeth, had been born in September, 1533. Orders were circulated throughout the kingdom to arrest preachers who maintained the Pope's authority, and to put the country in a state of defence in case the Emperor should attempt invasion. The King's subjects generally were required to swear to the Act of Succession; and those who refused were sent to the Tower, Sir Thomas More and Bishop Fisher among the first. Then, to prevent inconvenient preaching, the different Orders of Friars were placed under two Provincials appointed by the King. But the Grey Friars Observants declined the articles proposed to them by these Visitors as contrary to their obedience to the Pope; whereupon some were sent to the Tower, and soon afterwards the whole Order was suppressed.

It was fortunate for Henry that on May 11, this year, he was able to make a peace with his nephew, James V, which relieved him from the danger of a papal interdict being executed by means of an invasion from Scotland. Just about the same time William, Lord Dacres, who for nine years past had ruled the West Marches as his father had done before him, was committed to the Tower on a charge of treason, arising, apparently, out of border feuds. He was tried in July, and, strange to say, acquitted, for such a result of an indictment was then quite unheard of. And the joy of the people at the event was all the greater because it was known that Anne Boleyn had been using her influence against him as one who sympathised with Catharine.

But a more serious danger now appeared in Ireland. Gerald, Earl of Kildare, the Lord Deputy, who had used the King's artillery for his own castles, had been summoned to England in 1533, but delays ensued, and he only arrived in London in the spring of 1534, suffering from a wound that he had received in an encounter, and not likely to live long. He was not at first imprisoned, and efforts were made to lure his son, Lord Thomas Fitzgerald, over to England. But the young man (deceived, it is said, by a false report of his father's execution) rebelled, declaring that he upheld the Pope's cause and that the King's adherents were accursed. He murdered Archbishop Allen of Dublin, the Chancellor of Ireland (July 28), as he was endeavouring to sail for England, and became for a short time virtual ruler of the country, which he ordered all the English to quit on pain of death. Piers Butler, Earl of Ossory, however, made a stand for the King at Waterford, and Lord Thomas was compelled to raise the siege laid by him to Dublin, when Sir William Skeffington, appointed a second time as Lord Deputy, arrived from Wales in October; after which matters began to mend.

In England, to complete the work of the year, Parliament met in November, and passed, among other legislation, Acts for confirming the King's title as Supreme Head of the Church, for granting him the first-fruits and tenths before paid to the Pope, and for attainting More and Fisher of misprision and the Earl of Kildare of treason. But Parliament passed measures at dictation, and several of the chief lords of England were in secret communication with the imperial ambassador Chapuys to urge the Emperor to invade England.

Cromwell was now appointed the King's Vicar-General in spiritual things, and in the spring of 1535 the Act of Supremacy began to be put into execution. An oath to the succession of Anne Boleyn's issue had already been extorted in the previous year from the monks of the Charter House, which some of them seem not to have taken until after a significant visit from one of the London Sheriffs. But now they were required to swear to the supremacy in derogation of the Pope's authority. Prior Houghton, with two other Priors of the Order who had lately come up to London, approached Cromwell at the Rolls in the hope of obtaining some mitigation of the terms required; but unconditional acknowledgment of the King's supremacy was insisted on. All three refused, and repeated their refusal a few days later in the Tower. They were tried in April, together with Dr Reynolds of the Brigettine Monastery of Sion, who, having been also committed to the Tower, had joined in their refusal; and all received sentence together. With them also were condemned, for a private conversation about the King's tyranny and licentiousness, John Hale, vicar of Isleworth, and a young priest named Robert Feron; but the latter had his pardon after sentence, having turned King's evidence. All the others were hanged at Tyburn on May 4, with even more than the usual barbarities.

Next came the turn of Bishop Fisher and Sir Thomas More, who with three fellow-prisoners, Dr Wilson, Abell, and Fetherstone, priests lately most intimate in the Royal household, were warned that they must swear to the Statutes both of Succession and Supremacy. All declined to do so. Six weeks were given them to consider the matter; and visits were paid by Cromwell and other councillors to More and Fisher in the Tower to shake their constancy; but all in vain. Fisher denied that the King was Supreme Head of the Church of England; More said he would not meddle with such questions. Fisher was condemned on June 17, and was beheaded on Tower Hill on the 22nd. The King was all the more resolved on his death because the Pope had made him a Cardinal on May 20. On July 1 More was brought up for trial on a complex indictment, one article of which showed that he did not, like Fisher, expressly repudiate the King's ecclesiastical supremacy, but only kept silence when questioned about it. He made, as might be expected, an admirable defence, but in vain; and after his condemnation he declared frankly as to the statute that it was against his conscience, as he could never find, in all his studies, that a temporal lord ought to be head of the spiritualty. He was sentenced to undergo a traitor's death at Tyburn; but it was commuted by the King to simple decapitation on Tower Hill, where he suffered on July 6.

These executions filled the world with horror, both at home and abroad. The Emperor Charles V is said to have declared that he would rather have lost the best city in his dominions than such a councillor as Sir Thomas More. In Italy More was vehemently lamented, and men related with admiration the touching devotion of his daughter, Margaret Roper, who broke through the guards to embrace him on his way to the Tower. He was indeed a man to inspire affection far beyond his own family circle. Full of domestic feeling, yet no less full of incomparable wit and humour, dragged into the service of the Court against his will on account of his high legal abilities and intellectual gifts, he had refused to yield one inch to solicitations against the cause of right and conscience. A true saint without a touch of austerity, save that which he practised on himself in secret, he lived in the world as one who understood it perfectly, with a breadth of view and an innate cheerfulness of temper which no external terrors could depress. Of a mind altogether healthy, he was not beguiled by superstition or corrupted by gifts, but held his course straight on. Brought up in the household of Cardinal Morton, he had early devoted himself to learning, and became the special friend of Erasmus. His learning was entirely without pedantry, even as his humour was without gall. He loved men, he loved animals, he loved mechanism, and every influence that tended to humanise or advance society. He had served his King in diplomatic missions with an ability that was fully appreciated, and as Lord Chancellor with an integrity that was

noted as altogether exceptional. But his very probity had made him at last an obstacle in the King's path, and he was sacrificed.

The three priests who had refused to acknowledge the Supremacy were retained in confinement. Two years later Dr Wilson received a pardon. The other two remained steadfast during five years' imprisonment, and were executed in 1540.

Pope Paul III, who had conferred the hat upon Fisher (he had succeeded Clement VII in the previous year), would have issued a Bull to deprive Henry of his kingdom; but, owing to the mutual jealousies of the Emperor and Francis I, there was no sovereign who dared to execute the sentence. Henry, moreover, had been scheming for years with the citizens of Lübeck to fill the throne of Denmark with one who would unite with him and the Northern Powers of Europe against both Pope and Emperor; and, though his plan was a failure, the Danes elected a Lutheran King (Christian III), ill-pleasing to Charles V. Further, the English King was seeking to conclude a league with the German Protestants, and his intrigues gave the Emperor some anxiety.

During the latter half of 1535 the Bishops in England were inhibited from visiting their dioceses pending a royal visitation of the whole kingdom, while Cromwell sent out special Visitors for the monasteries, who with remarkable celerity traversed the greater part of the country in a very few months and sent private reports of gross immoralities, alleged to have been discovered in a number of the Houses they visited. It is impossible, for many reasons, to attach much credit to these reports, or to think highly of the character of the Visitors. The object was seen when Parliament met again in February, 1536, and passed, as the principal measure of the session, an Act for the dissolution of such monasteries as had not revenues of £200 a year. It was passed, as tradition in the next generation reported, under very strong pressure, and certainly, as the preamble shows, on the King's own statement of the results of the visitation. These, it was said, proved that the smaller monasteries were given to vicious living, while the larger were better regulated; though in truth the Visitors had reported abominations quite as flagrant in the latter as in the former.

Meanwhile, in January, Catharine of Aragon had died at Kimbolton. On hearing of the event Henry could not help exclaiming, "God be praised! We are now free from fear of war." If Catharine had lived, the Bull of privation might even yet have been launched when the Emperor arrived at Rome in the spring; but the King calculated truly The Court and Anne Boleyn wore mourning for Catharine. But Anne's own fate was near at hand, for Henry had long since grown tired of her, and could not make men respect her. He now said that he had been induced to marry her by witchcraft. In the course of the month she miscarried. On May Day there was a tournament at Greenwich, during which the King suddenly left her and went to Westminster. Next day

she was apprehended and taken to the Tower. One Mark Smeton, Groom of the Chamber, had been arrested and examined beforehand, and afterwards her brother George, Lord Rochford, and three other courtiers were likewise placed in the Tower. Anne was charged with acts of adultery with them all. She protested her innocence, though she acknowledged some familiarities. On the 15th she and her brother were condemned, and the latter suffered two days later with the four other supposed paramours. On the 17th a secret enquiry was conducted by persons learned in the canon law, after which Cranmer pronounced her marriage with the King invalid. On the 19th she was beheaded on Tower Green.

For some time before her arrest the King had been secretly talking of matrimony with Jane, daughter of Sir John Seymour, of Wolfhall, Wiltshire. On the very day of Anne's execution Cranmer gave the King a dispensation for this new match, and on the next day the couple were secretly betrothed. On Ascension Day, however (May 25), the King wore white as a widower in mourning; and it was not till Whitsunday, June 4, that Jane was openly produced as Queen, having been married the week before.

Parliament had been dissolved not long before Anne Boleyn's arrest. It was the same Parliament which had been summoned at Wolsey's fall, and it had lasted for six years and a half. A new Parliament was called, and met on June 8, to pass, among other things, a new Act of Succession in favour of Jane Seymour's issue, disinheriting that of both the two former Queens. The Princess Mary, though her chief enemy was now dead, was not restored to favour until, to make life bearable, she had signed without reading an abject submission, acknowledging the King's laws by which she herself was a bastard. Shortly afterwards died the Duke of Richmond, the King's natural son, who was believed to have been destined by Henry to succeed him on the throne in case of failure of issue by Jane Seymour, for he had procured a clause in the Succession Act enabling him in that contingency to dispose of the Crown by will. Another Act passed was for the attainder of Lord Thomas Howard, brother of the Duke of Norfolk, who had presumed to contract marriage with the King's niece, Lady Margaret Douglas. He died in the Tower next year. At this time also the office of Lord Privy Seal was taken from Anne Boleyn's father, the Earl of Wiltshire, and given to Cromwell.

In July there was a meeting of Convocation, over which Dr Petre presided as deputy to Cromwell, the King's Vicar-General. Since Cranmer had been raised to the Primacy several other Bishops favourable to the new principle of Royal Supremacy had been appointed, including Latimer of Worcester; and, as the King was hoping to strengthen his position by an alliance with the German Protestants, it was important to set forth by authority a formulary of the faith as acknowledged

by the Church of England. This was done in Ten Articles not greatly at variance with the beliefs hitherto received, though dissuading the use of the term Purgatory, and omitting all notice of four out of the Seven Sacraments. This omission of course attracted some observation. But as to their positive contents Cardinal Pole himself found little fault with these Articles, his main objection being to the authority by which they were set forth. They were printed as "Articles devised by the King's Highness to stablish Christian quietness and unity among us."

The legislation of past years had created much popular discontent, which was now increased by the dissolution of the monasteries. In the north rumours were spread that the King would appropriate all the Church plate; and when the Commissioners for levying a subsidy came to Caistor, in Lincolnshire, just after two small neighbouring monasteries had been suppressed, the people banded together to resist them. The Commissioners made a hasty retreat, but some of them were captured and compelled by the rebels to swear to be true to the King and to take their side. The insurgents likewise sent up two messengers to Windsor to lay their grievances before their sovereign. The answer returned by Henry was rough in the extreme, and he sent a force under the Duke of Suffolk to quell the rising, preparing himself to follow with another, which was to muster at Ampthill. The muster, however, was countermanded on news that the rebels were ready to submit; but Lincolnshire was scarcely quiet when a more formidable rising began in Yorkshire, called the Pilgrimage of Grace. A lawyer named Robert Aske caused a muster on Skipwith Moor, at which the men swore to be faithful to the King and preserve the Church from spoil; for here, as in Lincolnshire, men desired to combine loyalty with religion, which they believed to be in danger from the rule of Cromwell and such Bishops as Cranmer and Latimer. Aske and his friends got possession of York. They took an oath of adhesion from the Mayor and commons at Doncaster. They replaced the expelled monks in their monasteries. Pomfret Castle was delivered up to them by Lord Darcy as too weak to hold out, though the Archbishop of York had taken refuge with him there; and a herald named Lancaster, sent thither by the Earl of Shrewsbury, was forbidden by Aske to read the King's proclamation, though he fell on his knees and begged leave to execute his commission.

The Duke of Norfolk, sent by the King to put down the rising, joined the Earl of Shrewsbury and others in the Midlands, and sent an address to the rebels, offering them the choice of battle or submission. But on reaching Doncaster he found that the movement had assumed such dimensions that a conflict would have been disastrous; and accordingly he made an agreement there with the rebels (October 27) and arranged for a general truce in the north, while Sir Ralph Ellerker and Robert Bowes were sent up to the King to ask for an answer to

the demands of the insurgents. Henry wrote a temporising reply, but detained the messengers for some time on the excuse of various sinister rumours. Conferences were arranged in December at Pomfret and Doncaster, and a general pardon was proclaimed at the latter place. Hereupon the King, putting a smooth face on matters, wrote to Aske to come up and confer with him frankly; and, though not without misgivings in spite of his safe conduct, Aske came and seems to have been won over by royal affability. Early in January (1537) he returned to Yorkshire and did his best to allay disquiet, declaring that the King was every way gracious and had approved the general pardon,—that he was sending Norfolk once more into the north, and that grievances would be discussed at a free Parliament at York, where also the Queen would be crowned.

But the pardon had been already ill received at Kendal, in Westmorland, where the people said they had done no wrong; and grave suspicions were aroused in Yorkshire that the King was fortifying Hull and Scarborough. One John Hallom was taken in an attempt to surprise Hull, and Sir Francis Bigod made an equally futile effort to march on Scarborough. Bigod fled and was afterwards captured near Carlisle, where he had joined himself to a new rising provoked by the King's use of border thieves to keep the country down. The Duke of Norfolk, when he came back, went first to Carlisle, where he proceeded by martial law against seventy-four of the insurgents and terrified the country with savage executions. He then went on to Durham and York, where he endeavoured to learn who were chiefly responsible for the demands made and conceded at Doncaster. He got Aske into his hands and sent him up to the King; while the Earls of Sussex and Derby reduced Lancashire to submission by hanging the Abbots of Whalley and Sawley and one or two monks, and securing the surrender of the Abbey of Furness.

The King's principal danger was past; but meanwhile his anxieties abroad had increased. One thing was in his favour, that during the whole of 1536 the Emperor and Francis I were at war, and neither of them wished to interfere with him. But the Pope was trying to make peace between them; and having created Reginald Pole a Cardinal in December, he gave him on February 7 a commission as Legate to bring about Henry's return to his obedience to Rome. Pole was a grandson of the Duke of Clarence, brother of Edward IV; and his mother, the Countess of Salisbury, was a sister of that Earl of Warwick who was put to death by Henry VII. At the beginning of his reign Henry VIII wished to atone for his father's wrong and Reginald Pole, showing a great love of letters, was educated at the King's expense at Oxford and Padua. For this Pole was certainly most grateful; but he did not approve Henry's later policy and obtained leave to go abroad again. Pressed by the King for a statement of his views as to the Royal Supremacy, he had written a

treatise intended for the King's own eye, severely censuring his policy and the cruelty with which he had enforced it. The King was exasperated at this, and still more at Pole's being made a Cardinal. But it was now his duty to go to England, or as near it as he could, and publish the papal censures against Henry; for which an opportunity was offered by the presence of James V at Paris, where, on January 1, 1537, he married the French King's daughter Madeleine. There were many indications, indeed, that the English would welcome a Scotch invasion if Henry did not mend his ways. But Francis did not dare to receive at his Court a papal Legate denounced by Henry as a traitor, whose surrender he claimed by treaty; and Maria of Hungary, the Regent of the Netherlands, also warned Pole not to come near her, but to seek refuge with the Cardinal of Liége. Pole's mission was consequently a complete failure.

And now Henry, having reduced the whole of the north country to subjection, left unfulfilled his promise of a free Parliament at York. On Norfolk's return he instituted a Council to govern the north—at first under Bishop Tunstall of Durham, afterwards under Holgate, Bishop of Llandaff. Meanwhile a Council of divines met in London to supply some omissions in the King's book of Articles issued in the previous year, and the result was the publication of a treatise entitled *The Institution of a Christian Man*, which the King allowed to go forth as a manual of doctrine agreed upon by the Bishops, without giving it the express sanction of a work which had been examined by himself. It was accordingly called "the Bishops' Book." Five years later, a considerably revised edition of it, which had really been examined by the King, was issued under the title of *A Necessary Doctrine for any Christian Man*, and was commonly called "the King's Book." In both these treatises the old number of seven Sacraments was acknowledged, and the doctrine concerning each of them was defined.

On October 12 the Queen gave birth to a son (the future Edward VI) at Hampton Court. She died twelve days after. Three months previously James V also had lost his newly-wedded Queen Madeleine.

In the following year (1538) the suppression of the monasteries was carried further. Several of the abbots and priors were induced to make formal surrenders, which were often, no doubt, voluntary in one sense, since pensions were more acceptable than visitations. The King's agents were likewise zealous in putting down images, pilgrimages, and superstitions. A wonder-working crucifix at Boxley in Kent was destroyed; and a solemn enquiry was held into the nature of a venerated relic, the "Blood of Hailes," reputed to be the blood of our Lord.

Meanwhile the dissolution of the monasteries was quickened by information for treason against the heads of Houses who rejected the Royal Supremacy. The Prior of Lenton in Nottinghamshire, and the Abbot of Woburn were both executed. All friars were compelled to

put aside their habits, and their Houses were confiscated. These proceedings were not relaxed in view of danger from abroad, when the King heard of the ten years' truce made in June between the Emperor and Francis. In September the magnificent shrine of St Thomas at Canterbury was robbed of all its treasures, and the relics which had been the object of so many pilgrimages were burned. Henry's wrath was stimulated against the Saint who had brought a King of England low. The news of this outrage excited peculiar horror at Rome; but all the Pope could do was to reissue (December 17) the Bull of Excommunication already published in 1535, with additions setting forth the King's new enormities, and to attempt to procure its proclamation at least at Dieppe and Boulogne, or in Scotland or Ireland

But Henry anticipated the danger which threatened him. At the end of August Cardinal Pole's brother Sir Geoffrey was arrested; and, questions having been put to him concerning his communications over sea, the fear of torture wrung from him information which was thought to implicate his other brother Lord Montague and the Marquis of Exeter. These two noblemen were accordingly lodged in the Tower on November 4. Exeter would be next in succession if the King died without lawful issue, and Montague was the lineal heir of Clarence. The Marchioness of Exeter and the Countess of Salisbury, Montague's mother, were also closely examined. The two noblemen were tried for treason and beheaded on December 9, others who were found guilty along with them being hanged and quartered at Tyburn. Sir Geoffrey received a pardon on January 4, in consideration of his unwilling disclosures On the other hand, Sir Nicholas Carew, who was arrested on December 31, was found guilty of treason in February, 1539, mainly for conversations with the Marquis of Exeter, and was beheaded on Tower Hill on March 3.

The Pope, however, was now encouraged by the better understanding between the Emperor and Francis to send Cardinal Pole on a new mission to those two sovereigns to induce them to forbid commercial intercourse with England; and David Beton was at the same time made a Cardinal with a view to his publishing in Scotland the Bull of Excommunication against Henry. Pole travelled by land to Spain, and on February 15 was received by the Emperor at Toledo in spite of the remonstrances of the English ambassador, Sir Thomas Wyatt. Yet his arrival did not seem agreeable to the Emperor, who declined to do as the Pope desired; and Pole returned to Carpentras, where he stayed with his friend Sadoleto till he received an answer to a message that he sent to Francis. But the French King was only willing to prohibit intercourse with England on condition that the Emperor would do the same; and Pole's second legation bore no more practical fruit than the first had done.

the construction and repair of fortifications on the coasts, and general musters were held. The people, believing in the national danger, were zealous for the defence of the country. Parliament was called together in April, and occupied itself mainly in passing what was called the Act of the Six Articles for enforcing religious unity. This was an answer to the taunts that the English were heretics, and that the Pope's excommunication was well deserved. By this severe enactment denial of transubstantiation involved death by fire and confiscation of goods, no abjuration being allowed in bar of execution; and it was further declared felony to maintain, either that Communion in both kinds was necessary, or that priests or any man or woman who had vowed chastity or widowhood might marry, or that private masses were not laudable, or that auricular confession was not expedient. But for all these offences except the denial of transubstantiation, a first conviction was visited merely with imprisonment and confiscation; a second was punished capitally. There was also passed a great Act of Attainder against not only Exeter and Montague, but the Countess of Salisbury and a large number of other persons, some of whom were alive—for the most part refugees abroad—and some had been condemned and executed in recent years for treason. But the danger seemed even to increase in the latter part of the year, when the Emperor, on the invitation of Francis, passed through France on his way to the Low Countries, and was hospitably entertained in Paris.

In this crisis Henry sought security by arranging a new marriage for himself with Anne, sister of William, Duke of Cleves, who by his pretensions to Gelders was a thorn in the side of the Emperor, and had, besides, family and other ties with the Protestant Princes of Germany. With these, moreover, Henry had for some time been cultivating a good understanding and had given them great hopes in the previous years of a religious union against both Pope and Emperor. And though the Germans were sadly disappointed by the passing of the Act of the Six Articles, against which they strongly remonstrated, the political support of England was too valuable to be hastily rejected.

In November proceedings for treason were taken against the two great Abbots of Reading and Colchester; and against the Abbot of Glastonbury for felony; all three were executed. These trials were certainly irregular, and the treasons seem to have consisted merely of private conversations disapproving of Royal Supremacy and of the King's proceedings. But the unwillingness of these Abbots to surrender was perhaps their chief crime, and a rush of surrenders followed, so that very soon not a single monastery was left.

In the last days of December Anne of Cleves crossed from Calais to Deal, from which she went that day to Dover and on by stages through Canterbury to Rochester, where she remained all New Year's Day, 1540. Here she received a surprise visit from the King, who came incognito

and made himself known to her; as he afterwards stated, he was disappointed as to her beauty, though he had secured beforehand her portrait painted by Holbein. He returned to Greenwich and received his bride publicly in Greenwich Park on January 3. The wedding took place on the 6th.

Just six months later this marriage was declared null, but for the present no one doubted its validity. Believing that it would bring favour to the new German theology, Dr Barnes and two other preachers of what was called the New Learning, were indiscreetly bold at Paul's Cross; but what school of opinion would prevail was for some time uncertain. Parliament met on April 12, and under the management of Cromwell, who on the 17th was created Earl of Essex, did its best still further to enrich the Crown. The great Military Order of St John of Jerusalem was suppressed and its endowments were confiscated; a heavy subsidy was also voted, payable by instalments in four years. But, these things being secured, a great change took place. On June 10 Cromwell was arrested at the Council table and committed to the Tower, where he was questioned about the circumstances of the King's marriage, and forced to make written statements to serve as evidence for its dissolution. But nothing was yet known on the subject when the two Houses of Parliament, acting on a hint, prayed that the validity of his marriage might be inquired into by Convocation. This was done, and after various depositions had been read to show that the King had never given his "inward consent" to his own public act, a sentence of nullity was pronounced.

This removed at once any fear of a misunderstanding with the Emperor, while it disappointed Francis and the Duke of Cleves. Anne herself, however, consented to the separation and was provided for in England, admitting that she remained a maid. A month later it was announced that the King had married Catharine Howard, niece of the Duke of Norfolk, who was prayed for as Queen on August 15. Meanwhile, July 9, a Bill of Attainder was passed against Cromwell in Parliament on account of various acts, some of which were regarded as treasonable and some heretical, among the latter being his support of Dr Barnes. He was beheaded on Tower Hill on July 28. Two days later Dr Barnes, and with him Jerome and Garrard, the two other clergymen who had preached at Paul's Cross in the spring, were burned as heretics at Smithfield; while three of the Old Learning who had been attainted in Parliament were hanged at the same place as traitors.

It would be a mistake to say that Cromwell entirely directed the policy of England during the years of his ascendancy; for, as he told Cardinal Pole, he himself considered it the very height of statesmanship to endeavour to discern what was in the King's own mind and set himself zealously to follow it out. And this, indeed, is the explanation

of his whole policy. He laboured to satisfy the King; yet at times he mistook the King's intention, and had the mortification occasionally to see the King himself deliberately upset all that he had been endeavouring to establish, or even to incur the King's heavy displeasure. He maintained his position by pure obsequiousness, and there was no kind of cruelty or tyranny of which he declined to be the agent. Seldom have vast and multifarious interests been so completely under the control of a statesman so unscrupulous. He was continually open to bribes and was guilty of many acts of simony. No doubt there was something engaging in his personality to men who like himself could take the world as it came. His early wanderings had given him a knowledge of men which, combined with a first-rate capacity for business, had paved his way to fortune. They had also given him cultivated tastes and an acquaintance with Italian literature which few Englishmen possessed in his day. It was from a study of the great work of Machiavelli, at a time when it was still in manuscript, that he derived those political principles which guided him through his whole career.

For more than a year the King was highly satisfied with his fifth wife. In other matters he was not yet at ease. He had now no such convenient tool as Cromwell, and, distrusting most of his remaining ministers, stood in fear of a new insurrection. In April, 1541, a conspiracy was detected in Yorkshire to kill Holgate, Bishop of Llandaff, whom he had appointed President of the North, and take possession of Pomfret Castle. Though called a rebellion by chroniclers, the design was suppressed before it came to a head, and the conspirators were executed, some in London and some at York. It was clear that the north of England was in a dangerous state, and Henry thought it advisable to go thither in person with a force of 4000 or 5000 horse. First, however, he determined to clear the Tower of inconvenient prisoners. The aged Countess of Salisbury, who had been attainted in Parliament without a trial two years before, was beheaded in the Tower on May 28. Lord Leonard Grey was tried on June 25, and executed on the 28th for conduct considered treasonable when he was Lieutenant of Ireland.

The King left London for the north on June 30; but his progress was impeded by storms and floods, so that he only reached Lincoln on August 9. On entering Yorkshire he was met by the country gentlemen; and those of them who had taken part in the rebellion of 1536–7, including Edward Lee, Archbishop of York, made their submission to him kneeling, with large gifts of money and thanks for his pardon. The like submission and gifts had been made to him in Lincolnshire. He delayed his arrival at York till the middle of September, expecting (as he afterwards gave out) a visit there from James V. But as the Scottish King made no sign of coming, he left on the 27th on his return southward. By the beginning of November he

was again at Hampton Court, when secret information was revealed to him through Cranmer. The Queen, it was found, had before her marriage to him been too intimate with more than one person; and it was alleged that even during the royal progress in Lincolnshire she had secret meetings with a paramour. The supposed accomplices of her guilt were executed; and, Parliament having met in January, 1542, an Act of Attainder was passed against the Queen, who on February 13 was beheaded within the Tower. She steadfastly denied any misconduct since her marriage; and her fate has been thought to have been the result of political intrigue.

For about a year and a half the King remained a widower. Meanwhile it should be noted that, having obtained from Parliament in 1539 powers for the creation of new bishoprics, during the next three years he applied a portion of the confiscated property of the monasteries to the endowment of six new sees; one of which, Westminster, was dissolved in the following reign, but the other five, after some vicissitudes, are in existence at the present day. Here also may be mentioned the publication of an Authorised English Bible, which was first issued and ordered to be read in churches as early as 1536.

In March, 1542, Henry began pressing his richer subjects for a loan; which, though little hope was entertained of repayment, was generally granted, in the expectation that the money would be used in a war against France. But, though Francis and the Emperor were on the verge of war, and the former really invaded the latter's dominions in July, England remained neutral for nearly a whole year after. Henry's design was first to get Scotland completely into his power.

A brief account seems desirable at this point of the course of events in Scotland. At the time of Albany's final withdrawal from the kingdom in the early summer of 1524, James V was only twelve years old, and should have remained still for some time under tutelage. But the circumstances were peculiar. Albany had not relinquished his claims upon the government, but had left behind him a garrison at Dunbar, and his cause was still upheld by James Beton, Archbishop of St Andrews, and Gawin Dunbar, Bishop of Aberdeen. His party, however, had really collapsed, and in July Queen Margaret caused her son to be declared of age by a Council at Holyrood, at which most of the Scotch lords swore fealty. There seemed then to be a very general feeling for an agreement with England, especially as the lords were encouraged to believe that their King would be allowed to marry the Princess Mary, notwithstanding her engagement to the Emperor; from which, as Wolsey secretly informed Margaret, Henry intended to induce Charles to release her.

Unfortunately, the plans of the King and Wolsey included the reconciliation of Margaret to her husband Angus, who, after being for two years a refugee in France, came to England just as Albany returned, and

was bent on going back to his own country. Margaret would not hear of being reconciled to him—all the less as she had now bestowed her affections on young Henry Stewart, second son of Lord Evandale, whom she had made Lord Treasurer; and both she and Arran, the great rival of Angus, declared that if the latter were allowed to cross the border, negotiation with England was at an end. Angus, however, made his way to Scotland, and, together with the Earl of Lennox and some other gentlemen, scaled the town walls of Edinburgh at four o'clock on a November morning; after which they opened the gates to their companies, and, when it was day, proclaimed at the Cross that they came as loyal subjects objecting to evil councillors about the King. But, as the Castle opened fire upon him, Angus found it prudent in the evening to quit the town and retire to Dalkeith; and that same night Margaret took her son with her from Holyrood into the Castle for security. She then dispatched in his name an embassy to England, which, being received at Greenwich just before Christmas, proposed a peace, with the marriage of James to Mary, and returned with an encouraging reply. But Angus had been meanwhile making friends with Archbishop Beton and others who were displeased with the Queen's exclusiveness; and, when the lords came to Edinburgh for a Parliament in February, 1525, they compelled her to bring her son out of the Castle to the Tolbooth, where a Council was appointed to carry on the government; and the summonses of treason against Angus and his friends were declared untrue.

Margaret next sent a secret message to Albany asking for French support, but the time was unlucky, for the date of her messenger's instructions was just two days before the battle of Pavia. Indeed from this time the French were generally very cautious about interfering in Scotch affairs without the consent of Henry, who was always a possible ally against the Emperor, or might be a very dangerous enemy. And Henry not only favoured Angus, but remonstrated strongly with his sister on her efforts to procure a divorce from him. Angus thus had full control of affairs for three years, during which the young King was jealously guarded, and all important offices were filled by his relatives. It was a time when none could prevail against a Douglas. But Margaret obtained from Rome a divorce from Angus and married Henry Stewart, who was afterwards created Lord Methven; and her son, after repeated efforts had been made for his liberation, escaped to Stirling Castle in June, 1528. In a few months Angus and his brother Sir George Douglas were driven to take refuge in England, where, to James' great grief, they were well received by Henry.

James had no desire to quarrel with his uncle, but the intrigues of Angus, together with border raids, brought about the hostilities which we have noticed in 1532, when the Earl of Northumberland invaded the East Marches as far as the neighbourhood of Dunbar. By the mediation of Francis peace negotiations were opened next year at Newcastle, and in

May, 1534, peace was concluded in London. Henry then sent to his nephew the Order of the Garter and afterwards endeavoured, but without success, to draw him into his own policy in religion against the Pope. Henry might well desire this; for his own conduct had raised the political importance of Scotland among the nations. The Emperor courted James' friendship, and the Pope sent him a consecrated sword and hat, meaning to take away Henry's title of Defender of the Faith and bestow it upon the Scottish King. Scotland, moreover, was an asylum for persons who disliked Henry's measures against the Church; and there was a serious possibility of an invasion from Scotland to drive Henry from the throne if he would not make his peace with Rome.

In 1536 James went to France under engagement to marry Mary of Bourbon, daughter of the Duke of Vendôme; but the lady did not please him, and he actually married Madeleine, eldest daughter of Francis I, at Paris in January, 1537. He took her with him to Scotland; but she died in the following July. Next year he married Mary, eldest daughter of the Duke of Guise and widow of the Duke of Longueville. Thus he was still strongly bound to France; but France remained on good terms with England, and James had no desire to disturb the existing tranquillity. In 1541 died two infant Princes to whom Mary had given birth, and also James' mother Margaret, the Queen Dowager. Another child was expected in 1542, the year at which we have now arrived, when Henry, as we have said, was scheming to get Scotland completely under his power.

In the spring Sir Thomas Wharton, Deputy Warden of the West Marches, submitted to the King and his Council a proposal to kidnap James while he was somewhere near Dumfries, and to bring him to Henry. The project, however, was disapproved as dangerous and sure to be attended with scandal if it failed. In July the outbreak of war between Francis and the Emperor cut off Scotland from any hope of aid from France against English aggression; and, while James was anxious for a conference between commissioners of both realms to put down border raids, Sir Robert Bowes was sent down to the border and arranged with Angus an invasion of Teviotdale. It took place on August 24, when the English burned several places; but on their return they were caught in an ambuscade at Hadden Rig, Sir Robert Bowes and most of the leaders being taken prisoners. Angus, however, escaped.

That very day, in total ignorance of this reverse in the north, the Privy Council were making preparations for a more considerable invasion under Norfolk. The news of Bowes' defeat made Englishmen all the more eager to avenge it. But James had done nothing to provoke war. His ambassador was still in the English Court, desiring a passport for a larger embassy to treat of peace; and, though he hardly met with due civility, a meeting was at length arranged, which took place at York in September between commissioners on both sides. But musters were made at the same time all over England; and, as Henry would accept

no terms, without free delivery of the prisoners taken by the Scots and renunciation of their alliance with France, the result was war. After it was begun Henry published a manifesto in his own justification, in which James was reproached with having shown ingratitude for the protection afforded to him in his early years, by declining to meet Henry at York. The English King also revived the old claim of superiority over Scotland.

The Duke of Norfolk crossed the border in October, and burned Kelso and laid waste the neighbouring country, but was obliged to return to Berwick in eight days for lack of victuals. An army suddenly raised by James was only able to skirmish with the invaders and harass their retreat. James would have pursued them further to revenge the injury, but the nobles objected, and he returned to Edinburgh. He was warned not to risk his life, being childless, in dangerous expeditions. But in November he passed secretly to the West Borders as far as Lochmaben, and directed Lord Maxwell, the Warden there, with the Earls of Cassillis and Glencairn and other lords, to invade England near the Solway They entered the Debateable Land by night, in numbers reckoned at about 17,000, and burned some places on the Esk before daybreak on November 24. But Wharton at Carlisle, having got notice of the project, sallied out first with a small company to reconnoitre; and when others, following, brought up his numbers to about 2000, he crossed the Leven in view of the enemy. The Scots, believing that the Duke of Norfolk had come upon them, began to withdraw, discharging ordnance to cover their retreat, which they could only effect by fording the Esk with a moss on their left hand. But the retreat soon became a rout. Many were drowned in the Esk; only twenty were slain, and about 1200 prisoners were taken, including two Earls and five Barons. Deeply mortified with this disgraceful defeat, James withdrew to Edinburgh and then to Falkland, where he remained, ill and dejected, while news was brought him that his Queen at Linlithgow had borne him a daughter on December 8. He had no comfort in the news, and died on the 14th

The child was Mary Stewart, who thus became Queen when only a week old. On hearing of her father's death, Henry liberated the Solway Moss prisoners from the Tower, and called his pensioners, the Earl of Angus and his brother, to a conference with them, proposing a treaty between the two kingdoms, with provisions for the future marriage of Prince Edward with the new-born babe, who was to be brought up in England till she reached marriageable age. Having given pledges to promote this design, the Scotch lords were allowed to return to their country, for which they set out on New Year's Day, 1543, honoured with great gifts upon their departure. Meanwhile Cardinal Beton had claimed the government of Scotland under an alleged will of the deceased King; but, this being treated as a forgery, the claims of the Earl of Arran, as next in the succession, were admitted by the nobles, and Beton was thrown into prison. Hereupon the Cardinal laid the kingdom

under interdict. Nevertheless Arran called a Parliament, which met at Edinburgh on March 12, and in the main favoured Henry's policy; for the marriage in itself was generally approved, the Douglases were restored to their estates, and, the influence of Beton being excluded, an Act was passed to permit the use of English Bibles. But the English King's demand for the control of the young Queen during her childhood was absolutely refused, as likewise was another for the surrender of fortresses in Scotland; and a little later, Sir George Douglas being sent up with the Earl of Glencairn for an adjustment, Henry agreed that the royal child should remain in Scotland till she was ten years old, sufficient hostages meanwhile remaining for her at the English Court. To this, in effect, the Scotch lords were brought, though with difficulty, to consent in the beginning of June; and by the efforts of Glencairn and Sir George Douglas two treaties were concluded at Greenwich on July 1, for peace and for the marriage.

This arrangement offered a fair show of an international settlement; but there were secret articles, apart from the treaty, which Henry was getting his friends in Scotland to sign, and by which he hoped to keep the government of the country entirely in his power. Meanwhile, however, Cardinal Beton had been released from prison on April 10; Matthew, Earl of Lennox, who had just come from France (son of that Earl who had entered Edinburgh with Angus in 1524), sought to supplant Arran both as Governor and in the succession to the Crown; and Argyle and Bothwell joined the party to protect the rights of the Queen Dowager and the independence of the country.

Meanwhile Henry, having obtained another heavy subsidy from Parliament, had concluded, on February 11, a secret treaty with the Emperor against France, which was still unavowed when confirmed, first by the Emperor in Spain, March 31, and then by Henry at Hampton Court on Trinity Sunday, May 20. But joint demands were formulated to be made of Francis by heralds of the Emperor and Henry at once. Francis, however, refused passports to the heralds to enter his country and the demands were intimated in London to the French ambassador. Then on July 7 Sir John Wallop was appointed commander of a detachment which joined the Emperor at the siege of Landrecies; where, however, the joint efforts of the allies, though prolonged for months, proved a total failure.

Just after Wallop's departure the King, on July 12, married his sixth and last wife, Catharine Parr. England won little glory from the campaign abroad, though, strengthened by Henry's alliance, the Emperor was able in September to bring the Duke of Cleves into subjection.

Open war with France rendered Henry's designs on Scotland more difficult. To secure the aid of Arran he had made him the most splendid offers—that he should have the Princess Elizabeth as a bride

for his son, and that he should himself be King of Scotland beyond the Forth. But Arran could not easily withstand the growing feeling of suspicion against England; and, though he ratified the treaty with Henry at Holyrood on August 25, in presence of a number of the nobility, he had even before that date resigned the charge of the infant Queen and her mother to the Cardinal and his friends. He then sought a meeting and reconciliation with the Cardinal at Falkirk, where he abjured his Protestant heresies. Immediately afterwards, on September 9, they crowned the child at Stirling as Queen. Henry's anger was intense. But the feeling of the Scots against England was still more aggravated by the discovery that some Scotch merchant-ships, whose safety ought to have been secured by the treaty, had been arrested at an English port on the plea that they were carrying victuals to France. Henry, moreover, let the two months expire within which he should have ratified the treaty; so that the Scots justly felt they had been deluded. Early in October a French fleet arrived at Dumbarton with money to oppose the designs of England. With it also came a French ambassador, La Brossé, and a papal Legate, Cardinal Grimani. But the Earl of Lennox at once intercepted the money, and, to maintain his opposition to Arran, left the party of France and joined that of Henry.

In September, while professing peace with Scotland, Henry had meditated a further outrage by an invasion under the Duke of Suffolk; but this was wisely forborne. The Scottish people were already deeply incensed; and the English ambassador, Sir Ralph Sadler, had to leave Edinburgh for his own safety, and take refuge in Angus' Castle of Tantallon. In December the Scotch Parliament met, declared the treaties with England no longer binding, and renewed the old league with France. Henry immediately sent a herald to Scotland with a threatening and reproachful message to be read to the Estates. It was received by the Governor after the Parliament had been dissolved. It apparently helped to bring about a formal agreement which Angus and Lennox made with him on January 13, 1544, and in which the Earls of Cassillis and Glencairn likewise took part, all promising to unite against the old enemy England. But the same lords presently asked England's aid to support them in their own country; and a treaty was signed at Carlisle on May 17, by Glencairn and by the Bishop of Caithness in behalf of Lennox, binding them to procure Henry's appointment as Protector of Scotland, to put the chief fortresses of the country into his hands, and, if possible, to get possession of the young Queen's person, and convey her to England. Lennox was then to have the regency of Scotland and to marry Henry's niece, Margaret Douglas. This marriage actually took place in the following summer; and Darnley was born of it next year.

But already at the beginning of the same month of May a fleet of 200 sail under John Dudley, Viscount Lisle, had appeared in the

Firth of Forth and landed an army under the Earl of Hertford. The Earl first captured Leith, then burned Edinburgh and Leith also, and re-embarked in less than a fortnight, leaving a detachment to return to Berwick by land, which likewise wasted and burned everything on its way. Having thus dealt an effective blow at Scotland, which was followed up in the summer and autumn by continual ravages of the border, with destruction of towns and villages on a scale quite unprecedented, Henry crossed, on July 14, to the siege of Boulogne, which was formed before his arrival. It had been agreed, after some disputes, that this time the Emperor and the King should operate against the common enemy separately and join their forces at Paris. The siege of Boulogne, which was very protracted, was not quite in accordance with this plan. The Emperor advanced into the heart of France, and captured St Dizier after a six weeks' siege; but, in default of active support from his ally, on September 18 he made a separate peace with Francis at Crépy, and England was left to carry on the war alone. Boulogne had capitulated on September 14. Another siege—that of Montreuil—was abandoned, in which Count van Buren had been engaged with the Duke of Norfolk. The King crossed again to Dover on the 30th. In October, after the failure of a French attempt to recover Boulogne by surprise, conferences took place at Calais through the mediation of the Emperor; but peace could not be established, as the French insisted on the restoration of Boulogne, and the English on a promise to render no further assistance to the Scots.

The league between Henry and the Emperor had been hollow from the first; nor had it then been easily adjusted, the objects of the allies being entirely different. Henry had foreseen, long before he entered on it, that his Scottish policy would involve a war with France; the Emperor desired, if he could not drive the Turks out of Hungary, at least to break up the shameful alliance between them and the French King. The Pope meanwhile was urging both the Emperor and Francis to peace, so that a General Council might meet to put down heresy—that of England most of all; and now that peace was made, the Council was appointed to meet at Trent in March, 1545.

England being thus isolated, her resources were now put to a severe strain. Henry had already, at the beginning of the year 1544, been absolved by Parliament from repayment of the forced loan he had levied two years before, and it was not in this year that he began to debase the currency. On May 16, however, he issued a proclamation "enhancing" gold and silver, that is, raising the rate of the coins to prevent their being exported; for the quality of the English coinage, at this date, was still high, and it was consequently in much demand in other countries. But before another twelvemonth had expired, a debased currency was issued, which was afterwards lowered still further. Meanwhile, in June of this year a loan was obtained from the City of London

by the mortgage of some Crown lands, and in January, 1545, a new benevolence was demanded for the wars of France and Scotland.

For the subjugation of the latter country Henry had relied chiefly on the aid of the Douglases and of the Scotch heretics, who hated Cardinal Beton and desired the overthrow of the monasteries and the Church. But the Douglases were double-dealers, and, since Hertford's burning of Edinburgh, when the Governor released them from confinement to serve against the common enemy, they had shown so much loyalty to their country that they were absolved from attainder by the Scottish Parliament in December. The King on this gave ear to a project of Sir Ralph Evers and Brian Layton for subduing the domains of the Douglases, together with the whole country south of Forth. In February, 1545, accordingly, Evers and Layton raided the Scotch border in the usual fashion as far as Melrose, where they wrecked the Abbey and violated the tombs of the Douglases. Angus and Arran, however, met them at Ancrum Moor near Jedburgh and with greatly inferior numbers routed the English host, taking prisoners the leaders and some hundreds of their followers.

The war between France and England still went on, but was attended with little advantage to either side Marshal du Biez formed the siege of Boulogne in January, but as England commanded the sea it was ineffectual; and, though renewed efforts were made in the summer, they were equally fruitless.

The French, indeed, collected a great fleet under Annebaut and entered the Solent, where a squadron drawn up at Portsmouth was unable for some time to attack them for lack of wind. In preparing for action, moreover, the English lost a fine vessel, the *Mary Rose*, which heeled over by accident and sank before the King's eyes, almost all her crew being drowned. The French, on the other hand, would have attacked the fleet in Portsmouth harbour, but could not approach with safety; and though they overran part of the Isle of Wight they were soon driven out. They were then carried eastward off the Sussex coast, which they attacked with little effect, and after an indecisive action in the Channel, ending at nightfall, they retired to their own coast. The siege of Boulogne was then abandoned, and in September Lord Lisle landed in Normandy and burned Tréport; but sickness had broken out in the fleet and it returned.

That same September the Earl of Hertford invaded the Scotch Marches, took Kelso, Home, Melrose, and Dryburgh, and even outdid previous works of destruction. Between the 8th and the 23rd of the month he demolished seven monasteries, sixteen castles, towers, or "piles," five market-towns, 243 villages, thirteen mills and three hospitals.

In November Parliament met and, besides granting the King a new and heavy subsidy, put at his disposal the property of all hospitals, colleges, and chantries to meet the cost of the wars. Oxford and Cambridge

took alarm, but received assurances that they should be spared; there were limits, evidently, that even Henry would not exceed. There was also a heresy bill brought forward in the House of Lords, which after much discussion was read no less than five times and then passed unanimously; but apparently it was rejected in the Commons, for it did not become law. On Christmas Eve the King in person prorogued Parliament and is recorded to have delivered a remarkable speech, in which he referred to the prevalent disputes about religion and urged more charity and forbearance.

In the autumn there had seemed to be a prospect of peace with France. For peace the French were anxious if Henry could be induced to give up Boulogne. The Emperor offered his services as mediator; but a conference at Brussels led to no result, because, though the whole English Council was in favour of the surrender, Henry himself was firmly opposed to it. The Emperor was not greatly distressed by the failure, but sought to renew and strengthen his treaty with England, as the unexpected death of the Duke of Orleans at this time upset some arrangements in the Peace of Crépy, and he was determined on keeping Milan to himself. Another set of mediators also offered their services—the German Protestants, who, though quite alienated from Henry for years past by the Act of the Six Articles and the divorce from Anne of Cleves, were alarmed by the near approach of the General Council summoned to meet at Trent, which did in fact open its first session in December. Anxious to discredit the Council, it was important for them to make peace between England and France, and in November they sent deputies to a Conference at Calais, which, though continued into the next month, proved as ineffectual as that at Brussels.

Direct negotiations, however, took place between English and French commissioners in May, 1546, with the result that peace was finally concluded at Campe, between Ardres and Guines, on June 7, on conditions severe enough for Francis, binding him to pay all the old pensions due to England and a further sum of 2,000,000 crowns for war expenses at the end of eight years. Boulogne was to be retained in Henry's hands till all was paid; but some points were left to be adjusted later on; and Henry agreed to the comprehension of the Scots, provided they would be bound by the treaties of 1543.

Meanwhile he had just achieved one great object in Scotland, which he had been clandestinely pursuing for years in order to get a more complete command of the country. This was the murder of Cardinal Beton. He was aided by factions, political and religious, within the country; for the Cardinal had caused one George Wishart to be burned as a heretic in front of his Castle at St Andrews on March 2, and Wishart's friends swore to revenge his death. Early in the morning of May 29 a party of them entered the Castle when the drawbridge was down to admit workmen, struck down the porter and threw him into

the foss, then forced the door of the Cardinal's chamber, killed him and hung out his body over the walls. The event caused Angus, Maxwell, and others to renounce the English alliance and strengthen the Governor's hands against the insurgents. But the Castle of St Andrews was a strong fortress and could not be starved out, as the English, in whose interest it was really held, had the command of the sea. Towards the close of the year the persons chiefly implicated in the murder escaped to London, and those within made a capitulation with the besiegers that they would surrender as soon as an absolution came from Rome for the guilty parties. But this was a mere policy to draw off the besieging forces, for England had no intention of losing its hold on St Andrews.

The state of the King's health was now becoming critical, and in the prospect of a minority there was some speculation as to who should have the rule of his successor. By virtue of his birth Norfolk seemed highly eligible, and it appears that his son the Earl of Surrey (the poet) not only spoke of this privately, but had a shield painted with an alteration in his coat-of-arms suitable only for an heir-apparent to the Crown, which he kept secret from all but his father and his sister the Countess of Richmond. The matter, however, became known, and he and his father were both arrested on December 12, and committed to the Tower. Norfolk signed a confession of guilt on January 12, 1547. Next day Surrey was tried at the Guildhall, and he was executed on the 19th. Against Norfolk a Bill of Attainder was passed in Parliament, and only awaited the royal assent, for which a commission was drawn on the 27th; but the King died that night, and the Duke was saved.

The reign of Henry VIII has left deeper marks on succeeding ages than any other reign in English history. Nothing is more extraordinary than that within less than a century after Fortescue had written in praise of the Constitution and Laws of England, a despotism so complete should have been set up in that very country. But it was a despotism really built upon the forms of the constitution and due mainly to the remarkable ability of the unscrupulous King himself, who was careful to disturb nothing that did not really stand in his way. The enigma, in fact, becomes quite intelligible, when we consider how much weight the constitution itself allowed to the personal views of a very able sovereign. England was but a country of limited extent, without colonies or even dependencies except Ireland, or any continental possession save Calais. To frame a policy for such a nation required little more than one good diplomatic head, and when that head was the King's there was not much chance of controlling him. Henry VIII was really a monarch of consummate ability, who, if his course had not been misdirected by passion and selfishness, would have left a name behind him as the very founder of England's greatness. Not only was his judgment strong and clear, but he knew well how to select advisers. To

talk of parliamentary control is out of the question. The King called Parliament only when he wanted money, or when he wished despotic measures passed with a semblance of popular sanction. But the forms of Parliamentary legislation and control were kept up; and thus, with weaker Kings and a more effective popular sentiment, the ancient assembly afterwards proved able to recover all and more than all its former authority.

The old nobility were the King's natural advisers; the Commons could scarcely as yet be called a real power in the State. But the old nobility were reduced in numbers, and were no match for him in intelligence. They were superseded, moreover, in the end, by a new nobility created by himself out of the middle classes. Meanwhile, he took counsel both of noblemen and of commoners just as suited himself, and he soon found out who served him best. Early in the reign he made large use of churchmen, such as Warham, Fox, Wolsey, Pace, and Gardiner; for churchmen were generally men of greater penetration than ordinary lay agents of the Crown. A perceptible change took place in this matter, when with Cromwell's aid he compelled the Church to acknowledge Royal Supremacy and disown the Pope's authority. The churchmen then promoted were only those who fell in with the new policy and who, occupied in enforcing it on the clergy, were not capable of much service in framing Acts of State or assisting in secular government. For in truth this great ecclesiastical revolution was that which completed and consolidated the fabric of Henry's despotism. If among the laity he had neither lord nor commoner who durst withstand him, there were churchmen like some of the Observant Friars who actually spoke out against the public scandal which he was creating by repudiating his lawful wife; and the King felt, truly enough, that if he was to have his way, the voice of the Church must be either silenced or perverted. So the central authority of Christendom was no longer to determine what was right or wrong. In England the Church must be under Royal Supremacy.

To this decisive breach with Rome Henry himself was driven with some reluctance, for no King was at first more devoted to the Church or more desirous to stand well in the opinion of his own subjects. Nor could it be said that the Church's yoke was a painful one to mighty potentates like him. But wilfulness and obstinacy were very strong features of Henry's character. Whatever he did he must never appear to retract; and he had so frequently threatened the Pope with the withdrawal of his allegiance in case he would not grant him his divorce that at last he felt bound to make good what he had threatened. For the first time in history Europe beheld a great prince deliberately withdraw himself and his subjects from the spiritual domain of Rome, and enforce by the severest penalties the repudiation of papal authority. For the first time also Europe realised how weak the Papacy had become

when it was proved unable to punish such aggression. Foreign nations were scandalised, but no foreign prince could afford lightly to quarrel with England. Henry was considered an enemy of Christianity much as was the Turk, but the prospect of a crusade against him, though at times it looked fairly probable, always vanished in the end. Foreign princes were too suspicious of each other to act together in this, and Henry himself, by his own wary policy, contrived to ward off the danger. He was anxious to show that the faith of Christendom was maintained as firmly within his kingdom as ever. He made Cranmer a sort of insular Pope, and insisted on respect being paid to his decrees—especially in reference to his own numerous marriages and divorces. But, beyond the suspension of the canon law and the complete subjugation of the clergy to the civil power, he was not anxious to make vital changes in religion; and both doctrine and ritual remained in his day nearly unaltered. The innovations actually made consisted in little more than the authorisation of an English Bible, the publication of some formularies to which little objection could be taken, and—what has not been mentioned above—the first use of an English Litany. For though as yet there was no English prayer-book, a Litany in the common tongue was ordered in 1544 when the King was about to embark for France.

The Authorised English Bible was undoubtedly a new force in the religious history of England. Wiclif's Bible had preceded it by more than a century, and there had been earlier translations still. But Wiclif's attempt to popularise the Scriptures in an English form had been disapproved of by the Church, which considered the clergy as the special custodians and interpreters of Holy Writ, without whose guidance it could too easily be perverted and misconstrued. This was the feeling which inspired the constitution of Archbishop Arundel in 1408, forbidding the use of any translation which had not been approved by the diocesan of the place or by some provincial council. In days when the sacred writings were only multiplied by copyists, translations of particular books of Scripture, or even of the whole, might be episcopally authorised, if good in themselves, as luxuries for private use, without apparent prejudice to the faith. But Wiclif's version was regarded as a deliberate attempt to vulgarise a literature of peculiar sanctity which required careful exposition by men of learning. The vernacular Bible, however, was prized by many laymen, even in the fifteenth century, and certainly influenced not a little the religious thought of the period; for, in opposition to the special claims of the Church, the Lollards set up a theory that Scripture was the only true authority for any religious observances and that no special learning was required to interpret it, the true meaning of Holy Writ being always revealed to men of real humility of mind. This was also the idea of Tyndale, who, encouraged by a London merchant, went abroad and printed for importation into

England a translation he had made of the New Testament, not from the Latin Vulgate, like Wiclif's, but from the original Greek text; his aim being, as he said himself, to make a ploughboy know the Scriptures even better than a divine.

The invention of printing gave Tyndale's translation an immense advantage over its predecessors. It was smuggled into England and found no lack of purchasers, who were obliged to keep it in secrecy. But every effort was used by authority to put it down. Copies were bought up by the Bishops in the hope that the whole impression would be suppressed; and there was more than one burning of the books in St Paul's Churchyard. But the effect was only to encourage Tyndale to print off further copies and extend the scope of his labours; for he went on to translate some books of the Old Testament from the Hebrew. And in England, though his New Testament was denounced as erroneous and heretical (no doubt the language in many parts tended to discredit Church authority), yet the obvious thought presented itself that the best way to counteract the poison of an erroneous version would be the issue of one that was accurate and scholarly. So in June, 1530, when a royal proclamation was issued for the suppression of Tyndale's and other heretical books, it was intimated that, though translation of the Scriptures was not in itself a necessary thing, yet, if corrupt translations were meanwhile laid aside and the people forsook mischievous opinions, the King intended hereafter to have those writings translated into English "by great, learned, and Catholic persons."

A few years later, Cromwell having become Vicegerent in spiritual matters, Miles Coverdale under his secret patronage brought out in October, 1535, a complete English Bible, not, like Tyndale's, translated from the Greek and Hebrew, but, as the title-page announced, from the "Dutch" (meaning the German) and Latin—in fact, an English version of the Vulgate amended by comparison with the German Bible of Luther. This work, however, though dedicated to the King, was not issued by authority; and though Cromwell's injunctions of 1536 required every church to be supplied within a twelvemonth with a whole Bible "in Latin and also in English," the direction could not have been obeyed. In 1537 appeared Matthew's Bible which was really made up of Tyndale's version of the New Testament and of the Old Testament as far as the Second Book of Chronicles, the other Books of the Old Testament being supplied from Coverdale with alterations. Its origin would not have pleased the Bishops, but the facts were concealed; and, a copy being submitted to Cranmer, he wrote to Cromwell that he thought it should be licensed till the Bishops could set forth a better, which he did not expect they would ever do. The King approved; Grafton and Whitchurch, the printers, were allowed to sell it; and its sale was forced upon the clergy by new injunctions from Cromwell in 1538. Another and more luxurious edition, however, was called for, and Grafton went to Paris to see it

printed, with Coverdale's aid as corrector, on the best of paper with the best typographic art of the day. This work was far advanced when it was stopped by the French Inquisition; but Coverdale and Grafton succeeded in conveying away the presses, type, and a company of French compositors, by whose aid the work was finished in London in April, 1539.

That edition was known as "the Great Bible." It was issued by the King's authority and Cromwell's; but the clergy were by no means pleased with the translation, which they severely censured in Convocation in 1542, two years after Cromwell's death. They appointed committees of the best Hebrew and Greek scholars to revise it; but the King sent a message through Cranmer forbidding them to proceed, as he intended to submit the work to the two Universities. This was simply a false pretence to stop revision; for a patent was immediately granted to Anthony Marlar, giving to him instead of Grafton, who was now in disgrace, the sole right of printing the Bible for four years. The Great Bible continued to be used in churches, and six were set up in St Paul's Cathedral for general use.

These were the principal translations issued in Henry VIII's time; and authority being given for their use, those, who maintained the old Lollard theory that the Bible could be safely interpreted without the aid of a priesthood, were encouraged in their opposition to the Church. This theory was clearly gaining in strength during the latter part of Henry's reign and its adherents became still more numerous in that of his son. Men founded their convictions on an infallible book, were confident in their own judgments, and died by hundreds under Mary for beliefs that were only exceptionally held in the beginning of her father's reign. The pure delight in the sacred literature itself inspired many with enthusiasm; and among other results we find the musician Marbeck, who knew no Latin, compiling a Concordance to the English Bible, and the heroic Anne Askew, when examined for heresy, full of scriptural texts and references in defending herself.

These cases, and especially the last, deserve more than a passing mention. Some account has been already given of martyrdoms, both for refusal to acknowledge the Royal Supremacy and for doctrines of a novel kind. But the results of the severe Act of the Six Articles have not as yet been touched upon. They were not, in truth, so appalling as might have been expected. The presentments at first were quashed, and new regulations were made about procedure, which, with further modifications passed by Statute, considerably abated the terrors of the Act. But in 1543, just after the King's marriage with Catharine Parr, four men of Windsor were found guilty of heresy, of whom three were burned at the Castle, and one was pardoned. The man pardoned was John Marbeck, the celebrated musician just referred to, who possibly owed his escape in part to his musical talents; for he was organist of St George's Chapel. Yet it does not seem that he had really transgressed

the law in anything; and Bishop Wakeman of Hereford, at his examination, said with reference to his Concordance, "This man hath been better occupied than a great sort of our priests."

In 1546 the victims of the Six Articles seem to have been more numerous, and the chief sufferer was a zealous lady separated from her husband, and known by her maiden name of Anne Askew. She and three others were tried at the Guildhall for heresy, and confessed opinions about the Sacrament for which they were all condemned to the stake. Two of her fellows next day (one of them, Shaxton, had been Bishop of Salisbury) yielded to the exhortations of Bishops Bonner and Heath, and were saved on being reconciled to the Church; but Anne was resolute, and would not be persuaded even by the Council, before whom she disputed for two days when they evidently wished to save her, answering continually in language borrowed from Scripture. She was committed to Newgate and afterwards to the Tower, where she was racked some time before she was burnt at Smithfield. Suspicions seem to have been entertained that she was supported in her heresies by some of the ladies about Queen Catharine Parr, and she was tortured to reveal her confederates; but she denied that she had any. The story of her examination and torture written by her own hand and printed abroad for the English market, certainly added new force to the coming revolution.

There was indeed another great change bearing on religion and social life, though not much on doctrine or ritual—the dissolution of the monasteries. Its immediate effect was to produce a vast amount of suffering. It is true that a considerable number of the monks and nuns received pensions, but very many were turned out of the houses which had been their homes and wandered about in search of means to live. Even at the first suppression Chapuys was told that, what with monks, nuns, and dependents on monasteries, there must have been 20,000 persons cast adrift; and though this was evidently a vague and probably exaggerated estimate, it indicates at least very widespread wretchedness and discomfort. More permanent results, however, arose out of the prodigious transfer of property, affecting, as it is supposed, about a third of the land of England. It has been doubted whether the monks had been easy landlords; but when the monastic lands were confiscated and sold to a host of greedy courtiers the change was severely felt. The lands were all let at higher rents, and the newly-erected Court "for the Augmentation of the Crown Revenues" did its best to justify its title. Moreover, the purchasers, in order to make the most of their new acquisitions, began to enclose commons where poor tenants had been accustomed to graze their cattle, the tenants sold the beasts which they could not feed, and the cost of living in a few years advanced very seriously. This was one of the main causes of Ket's rebellion in the following reign.

Meanwhile, all over the country men beheld with sadness a host of

deserted buildings with ruined walls, where formerly rich and poor used to receive hospitality on their travels; where gentlemen could obtain loans on easy terms or deposit precious documents, as in places more secure than their own homes; where the needy always found relief and shelter, and where spiritual wants were attended to no less than physical. The blank was felt particularly in solitary and mountainous districts, where the monks had assisted travellers, often commercial travellers and "baggers of corn," whose services were most useful to the country side, with men and horses to pursue their journeys in safety. "Also the abbeys," said Aske, "was one of the beauties of this realm to all men and strangers passing through the same; all gentlemen much succoured in their needs with money, their younger sons there succoured, and in nunneries their daughters brought up in virtue, and also their evidences (*i.e.* title-deeds) and money left to the uses of infants in abbeys' hands—always sure there. And such abbeys as were near the danger of seabanks great maintainers of seawalls and dykes, maintainers and builders of bridges and highways [and] such other things for the commonwealth."

What arts and industries disappeared or were driven into other channels on the fall of the monasteries is a matter for reflexion. Rural labour, of course, still went on where it was necessary for the support of life; but some arts, formerly brought to high perfection in monastic seclusion, were either paralysed for a time or migrated into the towns. Sculpture, embroidery, clockmaking, bellfounding, were among these; and it is needless to speak of what literature owes to the transcribers of manuscripts and the composers of monastic chronicles. True, monasticism had long been on the decline before it was swept away, and monastic chronicles were already, one might say, things of the past; but it was in monasteries also that the first printing-presses were set up, and the art which superseded that of the transcriber was cherished by the same influence. Finally, the education of the people was largely due to the convent schools; and there is no doubt that it suffered very severely not only from the suppression of the monasteries, but perhaps even more from the confiscation of chantries which began at the end of the reign, for the chantry priest was often the local schoolmaster. Nor did the boasted educational foundations of Edward VI do much to redress the wrong, for in truth his schools were old schools refounded with poorer endowments.

Still more did the higher education of the country suffer; for the monasteries had been in the habit of sending up scholars to the universities and often maintained some of their own junior members there to complete their education. After the Suppression, consequently, university studies went gradually to decay, and few men studied for degrees. In the six years from 1542 to 1548 only 191 students were admitted bachelors of arts at Cambridge and only 173 at Oxford. The foundation

of Regius Professorships at Oxford and Cambridge was a slight compensation. The dispersion of valuable monastic libraries, moreover, was to some extent counteracted by the efforts of Leland, the antiquary, in his tour through England to preserve some of their choicest treasures for the King.

Altogether, no such sweeping changes had been known for centuries. As regards the land some of the results may have been in the end for good. Better husbandry and new modes of farming, no doubt, succeeded in developing more fully the resources of the soil. A check, too, was doubtless placed on indiscriminate charity. But problems were raised which were new in kind. At the beginning of the reign the chief evils felt were depopulation, vagrancy, and thieves. Economic laws, of course, were not understood; and attempts were made by legislation to prevent husbandmen's dwellings being thrown down by landlords, who found it profitable to devote arable land to pasture to increase the growth of wool. The frequent repetition of these Acts only shows how ineffective they were in practice; and in the beginning of the seventeenth century they had become so complicated that Coke rejoiced at their repeal. But the evils of vagrancy and poverty assumed new forms. The precise effect of the fall of the monasteries upon pauperism is not altogether easy to estimate, but the statement of Chapuys removes all doubt that it was the immediate cause of bitter penury. The evidence of the Statute-book on this point requires careful interpretation; for it was only in a later age that law was invoked to do the duty of charity. Down to the middle of Henry VIII's reign repeated Acts had been passed for the punishment of sturdy beggars and vagabonds; but it gradually came to be perceived that this problem could not be dealt with apart from relief of the deserving poor. In 1536 the same session of Parliament which dissolved the smaller monasteries passed an Act for the systematic maintenance of paupers by charitable collections; and, in the first year of Edward VI, Parliament for the first time attempted to deal with the two problems together, with penalties of atrocious severity against vagabonds. But severity was futile; the Act was speedily repealed, and under Elizabeth a regular system of Poor Law relief was established.

From the beginning of his reign Henry had been profuse in his expenditure. His tastes were luxurious and he gratified them to a large extent at the cost of others. He made Wolsey present him with Hampton Court, after the Cardinal's fall he took York Place and called it Whitehall; he purchased from Eton College the Hospital of St James, made it into a palace, and laid out St James' Park; he built Nonsuch and made another large park in the neighbourhood. Before he had been many years King, the enormous wealth left him by his father must have been nearly all dissipated. Yet the subsidies he required from Parliament were very moderate till 1523, when, as we have seen,

unprecedented taxation was imposed for the French war in addition to a forced loan, from repayment of which he was absolved by the legislature in the year of Wolsey's fall. Then in a few years followed the pillage of the monasteries, while throughout the reign there were numerous attainders involving large confiscations. In addition to this immense booty came further subsidies, a further forced loan for a new war with France, and a new release by Parliament from the duty of repayment. Finally, to relieve an exhausted exchequer, the King was driven to the expedient of debasing the currency. In 1542 a gold coinage was issued of 23 carats fine and 1 carat of alloy, with a silver coinage of 10 oz. pure silver to 2 oz. of alloy. In 1544 the gold was still 23 carats fine, but the silver was only 9 oz. to 3 oz. of alloy. In 1545 the gold was 22 carats and the silver 6 oz. to 6 oz. of alloy. In 1546 the gold was only 20 carats and the silver 4 oz. to 8 oz. of alloy. This rapid deterioration of the money, though it brought a profit to the King in the last year of £5. 2*s.* in the coinage of every pound weight of gold, and of £4. 4*s.* on every pound weight of silver, produced, of course, the most serious consequences to the public. Apart from this, no doubt, prices must soon have been affected by the quantity of silver and gold poured into Europe from Mexican and Peruvian mines But the great issue of base money in this and the following reign produced a complete derangement of commerce and untold inconvenience, not only by the sudden alteration of values but by the want of confidence which it everywhere inspired. Not till the reign of Queen Elizabeth could a remedy be effectually applied to so great an evil.

The King's high-handed proceedings, alike as regards the Church, the monasteries, and the coinage, lowered the moral tone of the whole community. Men lost faith in their religion. Greedy courtiers sprang up eager for grants of abbey lands A new nobility was raised out of the money-getting middle classes, and a host of placemen enriched themselves by continual peculation. Covetousness and fraud reigned in the highest places.

Yet "there is some soul of goodness in things evil," and the same policy that under Henry VIII destroyed the autonomy of the Church and suppressed the monasteries made him seek not only to unify his kingdom but to bring together the British Islands under one single rule. England itself, no doubt, was a united country at his accession, but its cohesion was not perfect. Wales and the north country beyond Trent each required somewhat special government; and Ireland, of course, was a problem by itself. Yet no serious perplexities had grown up when in 1525 the King sent his bastard son, the Duke of Richmond, into Yorkshire, with a Council to govern the north, and his daughter Mary, with another Council, to hold a Court on the borders of Wales for the settlement of disputes in that country without reference to the Courts at Westminster. This arrangement was soon set aside when

Mary's legitimacy was questioned, and the disaffection of Rice ap Griffith, whose father and grandfather had governed Wales for Henry VII, was undoubtedly connected with the Divorce question. A little later a new Council for the Marches was set up under Roland Lee, whom the King appointed Bishop of Coventry and Lichfield, and by several successive Acts of Parliament Wales itself was divided into shires, and the administration of justice in the principality assimilated to that which prevailed in England, only with a Great Sessions held twice a year in every county instead of quarterly assizes. The admission of twenty-seven members for Welsh constituencies to the English Parliament completed the union of the principality with the kingdom.

Of a similar tendency was an Act of the King's 27th year, by which the old prerogatives of counties palatine were abolished, and the sole power of appointing justices or pardoning offences over the whole kingdom restored to the Crown. Of the beneficial results of these changes it is impossible to doubt, especially in Wales, where "gentlemen thieves" had been a good deal too influential. The north of England was less easily coerced, and after the severe measures taken by Norfolk to put down the rebellion a new Council of the North was established, first under Bishop Tunstall of Durham, afterwards under Bishop Holgate of Llandaff. This Council which, like that of Wales, was abolished by the Long Parliament in 1641, was undoubtedly without parliamentary authority; it acted merely by the deputed authority of the Crown. Yet its acts could scarcely have been felt as extremely tyrannical after the submission of the whole country in 1537, renewed to the King himself when he went thither in 1541.

In Ireland the King's policy was after many years wonderfully successful. Early in the reign he had allowed the Earl of Kildare, as Lord Deputy, to manage everything, to treat his own enemies as the King's and appropriate their confiscated lands. This, however, could not last, and in 1520 the Earl of Surrey was sent over as Deputy, who with the aid of Sir Piers Butler set about reducing the land to subjection. He made a good beginning and handed over the work to Sir Piers; but the feud between the Geraldines and the Butlers made government impossible. Kildare was restored for a time, but, as we have seen, had to be recalled, whereupon his son, becoming the Pope's champion, almost wrested for a time the whole government of Ireland from the King. But before many years the Geraldines were completely crushed, and young Kildare and his five uncles were hanged at Tyburn. Lord Leonard Grey's government, however, was complained of; he was recalled and sent to the block. It was under his successor, St Leger, that real progress was at last made. Without attempting distant expeditions he endeavoured first of all to make the Pale secure, and by and by induced the Irish chieftains to submit, accepting titles from the King and renouncing the Pope's spiritual authority. The triumph was completed

by the passing of Acts both in the Irish and in the English Parliament by which the King's style was altered to "King" instead of "lord" of Ireland. The new style was proclaimed in England on January 23, 1542. When Irish chieftains sat in a Dublin Parliament as earls and barons, with the quondam head of the Irish knights of St John as Viscount Clontarf, a great step had evidently been taken towards conciliation. In 1542 it was announced that Ireland was actually at peace; and, although this state of matters did not continue, the end of the reign was comparatively untroubled.

Thus Henry, notwithstanding his defiance of the Pope, was wonderfully successful in making himself secure at home. Abroad he had warded off the danger of any attempt at invasion to enforce the papal excommunication by continually fomenting the mutual jealousies of the two leading princes on the Continent. The time came, however, when, neutrality being no longer possible, he prepared to throw in his lot with the Emperor against France; and it was in view of a war with France, as we have seen, that he attempted, just when Ireland had been pacified, to get Scotland completely under his power—a task which proved too much both for him and for his successor.

Naturally, the navy and the defence of the coast occupied much of this King's attention. From the earliest years of his reign, indeed, Henry took much interest in his ships. Trinity House owes its origin to a guild founded by royal licence at Deptford Strand before he had been four years upon the throne. Earlier still, when the *Regent* was burned in 1512, he immediately set about the building of the *Great Harry*, on board of which he received a grand array of ambassadors and Bishops when it was dedicated in June, 1514. She was the largest vessel then afloat, and her sailing qualities were no less admirable than her bulk. In 1522 Admiral Fitzwilliam reported that she outsailed all the ships of the fleet except the unfortunate *Mary Rose*. The Royal Navy consisted commonly of about thirty or forty sail, but it could always be augmented from merchant-ships, or ships which were private property; though it was reported by Marillac in 1540 that there were only seven or eight vessels besides the King's which were of more than 400 or 500 tons burden. Henry's solicitude about his ships was further shown on the sinking of the *Mary Rose* before his eyes in 1545. Next year, for the first time, a Navy Board was established.

The importance of the command of the sea was shown in two instances at the end of the reign, when the French besieged the English in Boulogne, and when the Scotch government attempted to besiege Henry's friends, the murderers of Cardinal Beton, in St Andrews. The hold which Henry thus had both on France and Scotland was important for his own protection; and the foundation of England's greatness as a world-power may be traced to a tyrant's strenuous efforts to defend his own position. Of less permanent importance in this way were the

numerous fortifications he raised upon the coast. He built Sandgate Castle in Kent, Camber Castle near Rye, and fortifications at Cowes, Calshot, and Hurst upon the Solent, and a number of other places besides.

As to his army, for the most part he was not very well served. The policy of his father had been to prohibit by law the large retinues formerly maintained by the nobles to prevent the renewal of civil war. The result was that, when troops were needed for active service abroad, the nobles had no personal following, but, being each bound by indenture to bring so many soldiers into the field, hired men for the occasion at specific wages. In consequence they were raw and ill-disciplined, and their extraordinary revolt under Dorset in Spain in 1512 was almost paralleled in 1523, when Suffolk, partly by the weather and partly by the insubordination of his followers, was compelled to disband his army and return to Calais. After that date there was no great fighting for nearly twenty years, when the King again became involved both with France and with Scotland. In this French war he supplemented his own forces by engaging German mercenaries who demanded exorbitant pay and cheated him besides. He also detained in England with the Emperor's leave two Spanish noblemen of great distinction, and took a number of their countrymen into his service, who were delighted with his liberality. The increase of English influence abroad during this reign was in fact due rather to the personal qualities of the King, and to the skilful use which he made of European complications, than to the number or excellence of the troops at his command.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE REFORMATION UNDER EDWARD VI.

"WOE unto thee, O land," said the Preacher, "when thy king is a child." The truth of his words did not recommend them to the Parliament of Edward VI; and, when Dr John Story quoted them in his protest against the first Act of Uniformity, he was sent to expiate his boldness in the Tower. Yet he had all the precedents in English history on his side. Disaster and civil strife had attended the nonage of Henry III and Edward III, of Richard II and Henry VI; and the evils inseparable from the rule of a child had culminated in the murder of Edward V. When, in 1547, a sixth Edward ascended the throne, the signs were few of a break in the uniform ill-fortune of royal minorities. Abroad, Paul III was scheming to recover the allegiance of the schismatic realm; the Emperor was slowly crushing England's natural allies in Germany; France was watching her opportunity to seize Boulogne; and England herself was committed to a hazardous design on Scotland. At home, there was a religious revolution half-accomplished and a social revolution in ferment; evicted tenants and ejected monks infested the land, centres of disorder and raw material for revolt; the treasury was empty, the kingdom in debt, the coinage debased. In place of the old nobility of blood stood a new peerage raised on the ruins and debauched by the spoils of the Church, and created to be docile tools in the work of revolution. The royal authority, having undermined every other support of the political fabric, now passed to a Council torn by rival ambitions and conflicting creeds, robbed of royal prestige, and unbridled by the heavy hand that had taught it to serve but not to direct.

Henry VIII died at Whitehall in the early morning of Friday, January 28, 1547. Through the night his brother-in-law, the Earl of Hertford, and his secretary, Sir William Paget, had discussed in the gallery of the palace arrangements for the coming reign. Hertford then started to bring his nephew, the young King, from Hatfield, while Henry's death remained a secret. It was announced to Parliament and Edward was proclaimed early on the following Monday morning. In the afternoon he arrived in London, and an hour or so later the

Council met in the Tower. Its composition had been determined on St Stephen's Day, five weeks before, when Henry, acting on an authority specially granted him by Parliament, had drawn up a will, the genuineness of which was not disputed until the possibility of a Stewart succession drew attention to the obstacles it placed in their way to the throne. But the arrangements made in the will for the regency destroyed the balance of parties existing in Henry's later years. Norfolk had been sent to the Tower, and from the sixteen executors, who were to constitute Edward's Privy Council, Bishops Gardiner and Thirlby were expressly excluded. To the eleven, who had previously been of Henry's Council, five were added; two were the Chief Justices, Montagu and Bromley, but the other three, Denny, Herbert, and North, were all inclined towards religious change. Besides the sixteen executors Henry nominated twelve assistants, who were only to be called in when the others thought fit. Unless, in defiance of the testimony of those present when Henry drew up his will, that selection is to be regarded as due to the intrigues of the Reformers, it would seem that Henry deliberately sought to smooth the way for the Reformation by handing over the government to a Council committed to its principles. Not half a dozen of its members could be trusted to offer the least resistance to religious change; and, when the Council assembled in the Tower on that Monday afternoon, it only met to register a foregone conclusion.

Henry had been given no authority to nominate a Protector; but such a step was in accord with precedent and with general expectation, and one at least of the few conservatives on the Council thought that the appointment of Hertford to the protectorate afforded the best guarantee for the good government and security of the realm. He was uncle to the King, a successful general, and a popular favourite; and, though his peerage was but ten years old, it was older than any other that the Council could boast. He was to act only on the advice of his co-executors; but there was apparently no opposition to his appointment as Protector of the realm and Governor of the King's person. On the following day the young King and the peers gave their assent. Five days later Paget produced a list of promotions in the peerage which he said Henry had intended to make. Hertford became Duke of Somerset, and Lord High Treasurer and Earl Marshal in succession to Norfolk; Lisle became Earl of Warwick, and Wriothesley Earl of Southampton; Essex was made Marquis of Northampton, and baronies were conferred on Sir Thomas Seymour, Rich, and Sheffield.

Half of Henry's alleged intentions were not fulfilled, a strong argument in favour of their genuineness; Russell and St John had to wait for their promised earldoms, and seven others for their baronies, nor would Paget have then selected Wriothesley for promotion. For scarcely was Edward crowned (February 20) and Henry buried, when the Lord-Chancellor fell from power. He had been peculiarly identified

with the reactionary policy of Henry's later years; and his ambition and ability inspired his colleagues with a distrust which increased when it was found that, in order to devote more time to politics, he had, without obtaining a warrant from the Council, issued a commission for the transaction of Chancery business during his absence. A complaint was at once lodged by the common lawyers, ever jealous of the Chancery side, and the judges unanimously declared that Southampton had forfeited the Chancellorship.

A more important change ensued. Doubts of the validity of a dead King's commission had already led the Chancellor to seek reappointment at the hands of his living sovereign, and the rest of the Council now followed suit. On March 13 Edward VI nominated a new Council of twenty-six. It consisted of the sixteen executors, except Somerset and Southampton, and the twelve assistants named by Henry VIII, but they now held office, not in virtue of their appointment by Henry's will, but of their commission from the boy-King At the same time the Protector received a fresh commission. He was no longer bound to act by the advice of his colleagues; he was empowered to summon such councillors as he thought convenient, and to add to their numbers at will. No longer the first among equals, he became King in everything but name and prestige; and the attempt of Henry VIII to regulate the government after his death had, like that of every King before him, completely broken down.

Few rulers of England have been more remarkable than the Protector into whose hands thus passed the despotic power of the Tudors. Many have been more successful, many more skilled in the arts of government; but it is doubtful whether any have seen further into the future, or have been more strongly possessed of ideas which they have been unable to carry out. He was born before his time, a seer of visions and a dreamer of dreams. He dreamt of the union of England and Scotland, each retaining its local autonomy, as one empire of Great Britain, "having the sea for a wall, mutual love for a defence, and no need in peace to be ashamed or in war to be afraid of any worldly power." Running himself the universal race for wealth, he yet held it to be his special office and duty to hear poor men's complaints, to redress their wrongs, and to relieve their oppression He strove to stay the economic revolution which was accumulating vast estates in the hands of the few, and turning the many into landless labourers or homeless vagrants; but his only success was an Act of Parliament whereby he gave his tenants legal security against eviction by himself. Bred in an arbitrary Court and entrusted with despotic power, he cast aside the weapons wherewith the Tudors worked their will and sought to govern on a basis of civil liberty and religious toleration. He abstained from interference in elections to Parliament or in its freedom of debate, and from all attempts to pack or intimidate juries. He believed that the strength of a King

lay not in the severity of his laws or the rigour of his penalties, but in the affections of his people; and not one instance of death or torture for religion stains the brief and troubled annals of his rule.

The absolutism, which came in with the new monarchy and was perfected by Cromwell, was relaxed; and the first Parliament summoned by the Protector (November 4, 1547) effected a complete revolution in the spirit of the laws. Nearly all the treasons created since 1352 were swept away, and many of the felonies. It was, indeed, still treason to deny the Royal Supremacy by writing, printing, overt deed or act; but it was no longer treason to do so by "open preaching, express words or sayings." Benefit of clergy and right of sanctuary were restored; wives of attainted persons were permitted to recover their dower; accusations of treason were to be preferred within thirty days of the offence; no one was to be condemned unless he confessed or was accused by two sufficient and lawful witnesses, and Proclamations were no longer to have the force of law. The heresy laws, the Act of Six Articles, all the prohibitions against printing the Scriptures in English, against reading, preaching, teaching, or expounding the Scriptures, "and all and every other act or acts of Parliament concerning doctrine or matters of religion" were erased from the Statute-book.

The main result of this new-found liberty was to give fresh impetus to the Reformation in England. The Act of Six Articles, with all its ferocious penalties, had failed to cure diversities of opinion; and the controversies of which Henry complained to his Parliament in 1545 now broke out with redoubled fury. Among a people unused to freedom and inflamed by religious passions, liberty naturally degenerated into licence. The tongues of the divines were loosed; and they filled the land with a Babel of voices. Each did what was right in his own eyes, and every parish church became the scene of religious experiment. Exiles from abroad flocked to partake in the work and to propagate the doctrines they had imbibed at their respective Meccas. Some came from Lutheran cities in Germany, some from Geneva, and some from Zwinglian Zurich. In their path followed a host of foreign divines, some invited by Cranmer to form a sort of ecumenical council for the purification of the Anglican Church, some fleeing from the wrath of Charles V or from the perils of civil war. From Strassburg came in 1547 Pietro Martire Vermigli, better known as Peter Martyr, a native of Florence and an ex-Augustinian, and Emmanuel Tremellius the Hebraist, a Jew of Ferrara, and from Augsburg came Bernardino Ochino, a native of Siena, once a Franciscan and then a Capuchin. In 1548 John à Lasco (Laski), a Polish noble, and his disciple, John Utenhove, a native of Ghent, followed from Emden; and in 1549 Martin Bucer and Paul Fagius fled hither from Strassburg. Jean Véron, a Frenchman from Sens, had been in England eleven years, but celebrated the era of liberty by publishing in 1547 a violent attack on the Mass. Most of these

were Zwinglians; and even among the Lutherans many soon inclined towards the doctrine of the Swiss Reformers. Of the humbler immigrants who came to teach or to trade, not a few were Anabaptists, Socinians, and heretics of every hue; and England became, in the words of one horrified politician, the harbour for all infidelity.

The clamour raised by the advent of this foreign legion has somewhat obscured the comparative insignificance of its influence on the development of the English Church. The continental Reformers came too late to affect the moderate changes introduced during Somerset's protectorate, and even the Second Prayer-book of Edward VI owed less to their persuasions than has often been supposed. England never became Lutheran, Zwinglian, or Calvinistic; and she would have resented dictation from Wittenberg, Zurich, or Geneva as keenly as she did from Rome, had the authority of Luther, Zwingli, or Calvin ever attained the proportions of that of the Roman Pontiff. Each indeed had his adherents in England, but their influence was never more than sectional, and failed to turn the course of the English Reformation into any foreign channel.

In so far as the English Reformers sought spiritual inspiration from other than primitive sources, it is probable, although the point is not capable of complete demonstration, that they, consciously or unconsciously, derived this inspiration from Wiclif. Like them, he appealed to the State to remedy abuses in the Church, attacked ecclesiastical endowments, and gradually receded from the Catholic doctrine of the Mass. The Reformation in England was divergent in origin, method, and aim from all the phases of the movement abroad; it left the English Church without a counterpart in Europe,—so insular in character that no subsequent attempt at union with any foreign Church has ever come within measurable distance of success. It was in its main aspect practical and not doctrinal; it concerned itself less with dogma than with conduct, and its favourite author was Erasmus, not because he preached any distinctive theology, but because he lashed the evil practices of the Church. Englishmen are little subject to the bondage of logic or abstract ideas, and they began their Reformation, not with the enunciation of any new truth, but with an attack upon the clerical exaction of excessive probate dues. No dogma played in England the part that Predestination or Justification by Faith played in Europe. There arose a master of prophetic invective in Latimer and a master of liturgies in Cranmer, but no one meet to be compared with the great religious thinkers of the world. Hence the influence of English Reformers on foreign Churches was even less than that of foreign divines in England. Anglicans never sought to proselytise other Christian Churches, nor England to wage other than defensive wars of religion; in Ireland and Scotland, which appear to afford exceptions, the religious motive was always subordinate to a political end.

The Reformation in England was mainly a domestic affair, a national

protest against national grievances rather than part of a cosmopolitan movement towards doctrinal change. It originated in political exigencies, local and not universal in import; and was the work of Kings and statesmen, whose minds were absorbed in national problems, rather than of divines whose faces were set towards the purification of the universal Church. It was an ecclesiastical counterpart of the growth of nationalities at the expense of the medieval ideal of the unity of the civilised world. Its effect was to make the Church in England the Church of England, a national Church, recognising as its head the English King, using in its services the English tongue, limited in its jurisdiction to the English Courts, and fenced about with a uniformity imposed by the English legislature. This nationalisation of the Church had one other effect: it brought to a sudden end the medieval struggle between Church and State. The Church had only been enabled to wage that conflict on equal terms by the support it received as an integral part of the visible Church on earth; and when that support was withdrawn it sank at once into a position of dependence upon the State. From the time of the submission of the clergy to Henry VIII there has been no instance of the English Church successfully challenging the supreme authority of the State.

It was mainly on these lines, laid down by Henry VIII, that the Reformation continued under Edward VI. The papal jurisdiction was no more; the use of English had been partially introduced into the services of the Church; the Scriptures had been translated; steps had been taken in the direction of uniformity, doctrinal and liturgical; and something had been done to remove medieval accretions, such as the worship of images, and to restore religion to what Reformers considered its primitive purity. That Henry intended his so-called "settlement" to be final is an assumption at variance with some of the evidence; for he had entrusted his son's education exclusively to men of the New Learning, he had given the same party an overwhelming preponderance in the Council of Regency, and according to Cranmer he was bent in the last few months of his life upon a scheme for pulling down roods, suppressing the ringing of bells and turning the Mass into a Communion. Cranmer himself had for some years been engaged upon a reform of the Church services which developed into the First Book of Common Prayer, and the real break in religious policy came, not at the accession of Edward VI, but after the fall of Somerset and the expulsion of the Catholics from the Council. The statute procured by Henry VIII from Parliament, which enabled his son, on coming of age, to annul all Acts passed during his minority, was probably due to an overweening sense of the importance of the kingly office; but, although it was repealed in Edward's first year, it inevitably strengthened the natural doubts of the competence of the Council to exercise an ecclesiastical supremacy vested in the King. No government, however, could afford to countenance

such a suicidal theory; and the Council had constitutional right on its side when it insisted that the authority of the King, whether in ecclesiastical or civil matters, was the same whatever his age might be, and refused to consider the minority as a bar to further prosecution of the Reformation.

No doubt, they were led in the same direction, some by conviction and some by the desire, as Sir William Petre expressed it, "to fish again in the tempestuous seas of this world for gain and wicked mammon." But there was also popular pressure behind them. Zeal and energy, if not numbers, were on the side of religious change, and the Council found it necessary to restrain rather than stimulate the ardour of the Reformers. One of its first acts was to bind over the wardens and curate of St Martin's, Ironmonger Lane, to restore images which they had "contrary to the King's doctrine and order" removed from their church. Six months later the Council was only prevented from directing a general replacement of images illegally destroyed by a fear of the controversy such a step would arouse; and it had no hesitation in punishing the destroyers. In November, 1547, it sought by Proclamation to stay the rough treatment which priests suffered at the hands of London servingmen and apprentices, and sent round commissioners to take an inventory of church goods in order to prevent the extensive embezzlement practised by local magnates. Early in the following year Proclamations were issued denouncing unauthorised innovations, silencing preachers who urged them, and prohibiting flesh-eating in Lent. In April, 1548, the ecclesiastical authorities were straitly charged to take legal proceedings against those who, encouraged by the lax views prevalent on marriage, were guilty of such "insolent and unlawful acts" as putting away one wife and marrying another. The Marquis of Northampton was himself summoned before the Council and summarily ordered to separate from the lady he called his second wife. Similarly the first Statute of the reign was directed not against the Catholics, but against reckless Reformers; it sought to restrain all who impugned or spoke unreverently of the Sacrament of the altar; the right of the clergy to tithe was reaffirmed, and the Canon Law as to precontracts and sanctuary, abolished by Henry VIII, was restored. It was no wonder that the clergy thought the moment opportune for the recovery of their position as an Estate of the realm, and petitioned that ecclesiastical laws should be submitted to their approval, or that they should be readmitted to their lost representation in the House of Commons.

These measures illustrate alike the practical conservatism of Somerset's government and the impracticability of the theoretical toleration to which he inclined. His dislike of coercion occasionally got the better of his regard for his own proclamations, as when he released Thomas Hancock from his sureties taken for unlicensed preaching. But he soon realised that the government could not abdicate its ecclesiastical functions, least

of all in the early days of the Royal Supremacy, when the Bishops and Cranmer especially looked to the State for guidance. Personally he leaned to the New Learning, and, like most Englishmen, he was Erastian in his view of the relations between Church and State and somewhat prejudiced against sacerdotalism. Yet, in spite of the fact that after his death he was regarded as a martyr by the French Reformed Church, he cannot any more than the English Reformation be labelled Lutheran, Zwinglian, or Calvinist; and, when he found it incumbent upon him to take some line in ecclesiastical politics, he chose one of comparative moderation and probably the line of least resistance. The Royal Supremacy was perhaps somewhat nakedly asserted when, at the commencement of the reign, Bishops renewed their commissions to exercise spiritual jurisdiction, and when in the first session of Parliament the form of episcopal election was exchanged for direct nomination by royal letters patent. But the former practice had been enforced, and the latter suggested, in the reign of Henry VIII, and Somerset secured a great deal more episcopal co-operation than did either Northumberland or Elizabeth. Convocation demanded, unanimously in one case and by a large majority in the other, the administration of the Sacrament in both kinds and liberty for the clergy to marry; and a majority of the Bishops in the House of Lords voted for all the ecclesiastical bills passed during his protectorate. Only Gardiner and Bonner offered any resistance to the Visitation of 1547; and it must be concluded, either that Somerset's religious changes accorded with the preponderant clerical opinion, or that clerical subservience surpassed the compliance of laymen.

The responsibility for these changes cannot be apportioned with any exactness. Probably Gardiner was not far from the mark, when he implied that Cranmer and not the Protector was the innovating spirit; and the comparative caution with which the Reformers at first proceeded was as much due to Somerset's restraining influence as the violence of their later course was to the simulated zeal of Warwick. Cranmer's influence with the Council was greater than it had been with Henry VIII; to him it was left to work out the details of the movement, and the first step taken in the new reign was the Archbishop's issue of the Book of Homilies for which he had failed to obtain the sanction of King and Convocation five years before. Their main features were a comparative neglect of the Sacraments and the exclusion of charity as a means of salvation. Gardiner attacked the Book on these grounds; and, possibly out of deference to his protest, the saving power of charity was affirmed in the Council's injunctions to the royal visitors a few months later.

The Homilies were followed by Nicholas Udall's edition of the Paraphrase of Erasmus that had been prepared under Henry VIII, and was now intended, partly no doubt as a solvent of old ideas, but partly as a corrective of the extreme Protestant versions of Tyndall and Coverdale, which, now that Henry's prohibition was relaxed, recovered

their vogue. The substitution of English for Latin in the services of the Church was gradually carried out in the Chapel Royal as an example to the rest of the kingdom. Compline was sung in English on Easter Monday, 1547; the sermon was preached, and the *Te Deum* sung, in English on September 18 to celebrate Pinkie; and at the opening of Parliament on November 4, the *Gloria in Excelsis*, the Creed, and the *Agnus* were all sung in English. Simultaneously, Sternhold, a gentleman of the Court, was composing his metrical version of the Psalms in English, which was designed to supplant the "lewd" ballads of the people and in fact eventually made "psalm-singing" a characteristic of advanced ecclesiastical Reformers.

The general Visitation in the summer and autumn of 1547 was mainly concerned with reforming practical abuses, with attempts to compel the wider use of English in services, the removal of images that were abused, and a full recognition of the Supremacy of the boy-King. In November and December Convocation recommended the administration of the Sacrament in both kinds, and liberty for priests to marry; but the latter change did not receive parliamentary sanction until the following year. The bill against "unreverent" speaking of the Sacrament was, by skilful parliamentary strategy which seems to have been due to Somerset, combined with one for its administration in both kinds, the motive being obviously to induce Catholics to vote for it for the sake of the first part, and Reformers for the sake of the second. The Chantries Bill was in the main a renewal of the Act of 1545; but its object was now declared to be the endowment of education, and not the defence of the realm; and the reason alleged for suppression was the encouragement that chantries gave to superstition and not their appropriation by private persons. Such opposition as this bill encountered was due less to theological objections than to the reluctance of corporations to surrender any part of their revenues; and Gardiner subsequently expressed his concurrence in the measure. Its effect on gilds was to convert such of their revenues as had previously been devoted to obits and masses into a rent paid to the Crown; but a bill, which was introduced a year later and passed the House of Commons, to carry out the intentions of founding schools alleged in the Chantries Act, disappeared after its first reading in the House of Lords on February 18, 1549.

Immediately after the prorogation in January, 1548, questions were addressed to the Bishops as to the best form of Communion service; the answers varied, some being in favour of the exclusive use of English, some of the exclusive use of Latin. The form actually adopted approaches most nearly to Tunstall's recommendation, a compromise whereby Latin was retained for the essential part of the Mass, while certain prayers in English were adopted. This new Order for Communion was issued in March, 1548, a Proclamation ordering its use after Easter was prefixed, and in a rubric all "varying of any rite or ceremony in the Mass" was

forbidden. A more decided innovation was made in February, when by Proclamation the Council ordered the removal of all images, under the impression that this drastic measure would cause less disturbance than the widespread contentions as to whether the images were abused or not. Ashes and palms and candles on Candlemas Day had been forbidden in January; and soon afterwards a Proclamation was issued against the practice of creeping to the cross on Good Friday and the use of holy bread and holy water. These prohibitions had been contemplated under Henry VIII; they met with guarded approval from Gardiner; and they were comparatively slight concessions to the Reformers in a Proclamation, the main purpose of which was to check unauthorised innovations. The Council also sought to remove a fruitful cause of tumult by forbidding the clergy to preach outside their own cures without a special licence. How far this bore hardly on the Catholics depends upon the proportion of Catholics to Reformers among the beneficed clergy; but it is fairly obvious that it was directed against the two extremes, the ejected monks on the one hand and the itinerant "hot-gospellers" on the other.

These measures were temporary expedients designed to preserve some sort of quiet, pending the production of the one "uniform and godly" order of service towards which the Church had been moving ever since the break with Rome. The assertion of the national character of the English Church necessarily involved an attempt at uniformity in its services. The legislation of 1547 seemed to imply unlimited religious liberty, and to leave the settlement of religious controversy to public discussion; but it was not possible to carry out a reformation solely by means of discussion. Local option, too, was alien to the centralising government of the Tudors and, unchecked, might well have precipitated a Thirty Years' War in England. Uniformity, however, was not the end which the government had in view, so much as the means to ensure peace and quietness. Somerset was less anxious to obliterate the liturgical variations between one parish and another, than to check the contention between Catholics and Reformers which made every parish the scene of disorder and strife; and the only way he perceived of effecting this object was to draw up one uniform order, a compromise and a standard which all might be persuaded or compelled to observe. Nor was the idea of uniformity a novel one. There were various Uses in medieval England, those of York, Hereford, Lincoln, and Sarum; but the divergence between these forms of service was slight, and before the Reformation the Sarum Use seems to have prevailed over the greater part of the kingdom.

As regards doctrine, the several formularies issued by Henry VIII accustomed men to the idea that the teaching of the Church of England should be uniform and something different from that of either Catholic or Reformed Churches on the Continent. Nor was it only in the eyes of antipapalists that some reformation of Church service books seemed

necessary. The reformed Breviary of Cardinal Quignon, dedicated in 1535 to Paul III, anticipated many of the changes which Cranmer made in the ancient Use. In Catholic as well as in Protestant churches the medieval services were simplified and shortened, partly in view of the busier life of the sixteenth century, and partly to allow more time for preaching and reading the Scriptures.

Thus Cranmer was only following the general tendency when, in 1543, he obtained Henry's consent to the examination and reformation of the Church service books. For some years he laboured at this task; but what stage he had reached in 1547 when Convocation demanded the production of his work is not clear. That demand was refused; and it was not until September, 1548, that the final stage in the evolution of the First Book of Common Prayer was commenced. Its development remains shrouded in obscurity. There is no trace of any formal commission to execute the task, of the composition of the revising body, or of the place where it carried on its work. Cranmer without doubt took the principal part, and once at least he called other divines to help him at Windsor; but it is unsafe to assume that the revisers continued to sit there, or indeed that there was any definite body of revisers at all. Probably about the end of October most of the Bishops were invited to subscribe to the completed book; but it seems to have undergone further alteration without their consent, and there is not sufficient evidence to show that it was submitted to Convocation. In December, it was in the House of Lords the subject of an animated debate in which Cranmer, Ridley, and Sir Thomas Smith defended, and Tunstall, Bonner, Thirlby, and Heath attacked, the way in which it treated the doctrine of the Mass.

Cranmer himself had already advanced beyond the point of view adopted in the First Book of Common Prayer. In the autumn of 1548 Bullinger's correspondents had rejoiced over the Archbishop's abandonment of Lutheran views; but the doctrine assumed, if not affirmed, in the new Book seemed to them to constitute "a marvellous recantation." The First Book of Common Prayer bore, indeed, little resemblance to the service-books of the Zwinglian and Calvinistic Churches. Its affinity with Lutheran liturgies was more marked, because the Anglican and Lutheran revisers made the ancient uses of the Church their groundwork, while the other Reformed churches sought to obliterate as far as possible all traces of the Mass. It is the most conservative of all the liturgies of the Reformation; its authors wished to build upon, and not to destroy, the past; and the materials on which they worked were almost exclusively the Sarum Use and the Breviary of Cardinal Quignon. Whatever intention they may have had of denying the supplemental character of the sacrifice of the Mass was studiously veiled by the retention of Roman terminology in a somewhat equivocal sense; room was to be made, if possible, for both interpretations; the sacrifice might be regarded as real and absolute, or merely as

commemorative and analogical. The "abominable canon" was transformed because it shut the door on all but the Roman doctrine of the Mass, and the design of the government was to open the door to the New Learning without definitely closing it on the Old.

The intention was to make the uniform order tolerable to as many as was possible, and the result was a cautious and tentative compromise, a sort of Anglican *Interim*, which was more successful than its German counterpart. The penalties attached to its non-observance by the First Act of Uniformity were milder than those imposed by any of the subsequent Acts, and they were limited to the clergy. Neither in the First Act of Uniformity nor in the First Book of Common Prayer is there any attempt to impose a doctrinal test or dogmatic unity. All that was enforced was a uniformity of service; and even here considerable latitude was allowed in details like vestments and ritual. A few months later a licensed preacher declared at St Paul's, that faith was not to be "coacted," but that every man might believe as he would. Doctrinal unity was in fact incompatible with that appeal to private judgment which was the essence of the Reformation, and Somerset's government was wise in limiting its efforts to securing an outward and limited uniformity.

Even this was sufficiently difficult. Eager Reformers began at once to agitate for the removal of those parts of the Book of Common Prayer which earned Gardiner's commendation, while Catholics resented its departure from the standard of orthodoxy set up by the Six Articles. Religious liberty was in itself distasteful to the majority; and zealots on either side were less angered by the persecution of themselves than by the toleration of their enemies. Dislike of the new service book was keenest in the west, where the men of Cornwall spoke no English and could not understand an English service book; they knew little Latin, but they were accustomed to the phrases of the ancient Use, and men tolerate the incomprehensible more easily than the unfamiliar. So they rose in July, 1549, and demanded the restoration of the old service, the old ceremonies, the old images, and the ancient monastic endowments. They asked that the Sacrament should be administered to laymen in one kind and only at Easter—a strange demand in the mouths of those who maintained the supreme importance of the sacramental system—and that all who refused to worship it should suffer death as heretics; the Bibles were to be called in again, and Cardinal Pole was to be made first or second in the King's Council.

On the whole the Protector's religious policy was accompanied by singularly little persecution; and the instances quoted by Roman Catholic writers date almost without exception from the period after his fall. The Princess Mary flatly refused to obey the new law; and after some remonstrance Somerset granted her permission to hear Mass privately in her own house. Gardiner was more of an opportunist than Mary; probably he thought that his opposition would be the more effective

for being less indiscriminate. But it was no less deliberate, and in the early and effective days of the Royal Supremacy, when Bishops were regarded as ecclesiastical sheriffs, their resistance to authority was as little tolerated as that of the soldier or the civil servant would be now. Gardiner was sent to the Fleet, but he was treated by Somerset with what was considered excessive lenience; and in January, 1548, he was, by the King's general pardon, released. He returned to his diocese, and preached obedience to the Council on the ground that to suffer evil was a Christian's duty. The reason was scarcely pleasing to the government, and on June 29 he was ordered to preach a sermon at Whitehall declaring the supreme ecclesiastical authority of the young King during his minority; at the same time he was forbidden to deal with the doctrines that were in dispute. On neither point did he give satisfaction, and on the following day he was sent to the Tower. Bonner was sent to the Marshalsea for a similar reason. He had protested against the visitation of 1547, but withdrew his protest, and after a few weeks in the Fleet remained at liberty until September, 1549. He was then accused of not enforcing the new Book of Common Prayer and was ordered to uphold the ecclesiastical authority of the King in a sermon at St Paul's; on his failure to do so he was imprisoned and deprived by Cranmer of his bishopric; and at the same time his chaplain Feckenham was sent to the Tower. These, however, are practically the only instances of religious persecution exercised during Somerset's protectorate.

This comparative moderation, while consonant with the Protector's own inclination, was also rendered advisable by the critical condition of England's relations with foreign powers. Any violent breach with Catholicism, any bitter persecution of its adherents, would have turned into open enmity the lukewarm friendship of Charles V, precipitated that hostile coalition of Catholic Europe for which the Pope and Cardinal Pole were intriguing, and rendered impossible the union with Scotland on which the Tudors had set their hearts. For this reason Somerset declined (March, 1547) the proffered alliance of the German Protestant Princes; and, to strengthen his position, he began negotiations for a treaty with France, and discussed the possibility of a marriage between the Princess Elizabeth and a member of the French royal family. The treaty was on the point of ratification when the death of Francis I (March 31) produced a revolution in French policy. The new King, Henry II, had, when Dauphin, proclaimed his intention of demanding the immediate retrocession of Boulogne; but his designs were not confined to the expulsion of the English from France. He also dreamt of a union with Scotland. Through Diane de Poitiers the Guise influence was strong at Paris; through Mary de Guise, the Queen Regent of Scotland, it was almost as powerful at Edinburgh; and England was menaced with a *pacte de famille* more threatening than that of the Bourbons two centuries later. Even Francis had considered a scheme

for marrying the infant Queen of Scots to a French Prince; and, while Henry VIII in his last days had been organising a new invasion of Scotland, the French King had been equally busy with preparations for the defence of his ancient allies.

Henry II of France changed a defensive into an offensive policy; and, in taking up the Scottish policy urged upon him by Henry VIII, Somerset was seeking, not merely to carry out one of the most cherished of Tudor aims, but to ward off a danger which now presented itself in more menacing guise than ever before. There might be doubts as to the policy of pressing the union with Scotland at that juncture—there could be none as to the overwhelming and immediate necessity of preventing a union between Scotland and France; and Gardiner's advice, to let the Scots be Scots until the King of England came of age, would have been fatal unless he could guarantee a similar abstinence during the same period on the part of Henry II. Somerset, however, pursued methods different from those of Henry VIII. He abandoned alike the feudal claim to suzerainty over Scotland and the claim to sovereignty which Henry had asserted in 1542; he refrained from offensive references to James V as a "pretensed king"; he endeavoured to persuade the Scots that union was as much the interest of Scotland as of England; and all he required was the fulfilment of the treaty which the Scots themselves had made in 1543. His efforts were vain; encouraged by French aid in men, money, and ships, the Scottish government refused to negotiate, and stirred up trouble in Ireland. In September, 1547, the Protector crossed the border, and on the 10th he won the crushing victory of Pinkie Cleugh. The result was to place the Lowlands at England's mercy; and, thinking he had shown the futility of resistance, Somerset attempted to complete the work by conciliation.

During the winter he put forward some remarkable suggestions for the Union between England and Scotland. He proposed to abolish the names of English and Scots associated with centuries of strife, and to "take again the old indifferent name of Britons." The United Kingdom was to be known as the Empire, and its sovereign as the Emperor of Great Britain. There was to be no forfeiture of lands or of liberty, but freedom of trade and of marriage. Scotland was to retain her local autonomy, and the children of her Queen were to rule over England. Never in the history of the two realms had such liberal terms been offered, but reason, which might have counselled acceptance, was no match for pride, prejudice, and vested interests. Care was taken that these proposals should not reach the mass of the Scottish people. Most of the nobility were in receipt of French pensions; and the influence of the Church was energetically thrown into the scale against accommodation with a schismatic enemy. It was only among the peasantry, where Protestantism had made some way, that the Union with England was popular; and that influence was more than counterbalanced by the

presence of French soldiery in the streets of Edinburgh and in most of the strongholds of Scotland. The seizure of Haddington in April, 1548, secured for a year the English control of the Lowlands; but it did not prevent the young Queen's transportation to France, where she was at once betrothed to the Dauphin. This step provoked Somerset in October to revive once more England's feudal claims over Scotland, and to hint that the English King had a voice in the marriage of his vassal. But the Guises could afford to laugh at threats, since they knew that the internal condition of England in 1549 prevented the threats being backed by adequate force in Scotland or in France. In both kingdoms they became more aggressive; they were in communication with rebels in Ireland, and in January, 1549, a French emissary was sent to England to see if Thomas Seymour's conspiracy might be fanned into civil war.

Thomas Seymour, the only one of the Protector's brothers who showed any aptitude or inclination for public life, had served with distinction on sea and land under Henry VIII. He had commanded a fleet in the Channel in 1545, had been made master of the Ordnance, and had wooed Catharine Parr before she became Henry's sixth wife. A few days before the end of the late reign he was sworn of the Privy Council; and on Edward's accession he was made Baron Seymour and Lord High Admiral. These dignities seemed to him poor compared with his brother's, and he thought he ought to be governor of the King's person. After unsuccessful attempts to secure the hands of the Princess Mary, the Princess Elizabeth, and Anne of Cleves, he married Catharine Parr without consulting his colleagues; and before her death he renewed his advances to the Princess Elizabeth. He refused the command of the fleet during the Pinkie campaign, and stayed at home to create a party for himself in the country. He suffered pirates to prey on the trade of the Channel, and himself received a share of their ill-gotten goods; he made a corrupt bargain with Sir William Sharington, who provided him with money by tampering with the Bristol mint, and he began to store arms and ammunition in various strongholds which he acquired for the purpose. The disclosure of Sharington's frauds (January, 1549) brought Seymour's plots to light. After many examinations, in which Warwick and Southampton took a leading part, a bill of attainder against the Admiral was introduced into Parliament; it passed, with a few dissentients, in the House of Commons, and unanimously in the House of Lords, and on March 20 Seymour was executed. The sentence was probably just, but the Protector paid dearly for his weakness in allowing it to be carried out. His enemies, such as Warwick and Southampton, who seem to have been the prime movers in Seymour's ruin, perceived more clearly than Somerset, how fatally his brother's death would undermine his own position and alienate popular favour in the struggle on which he had now embarked in the cause of the poor against the great majority of the Council and of the ruling classes in England.

This struggle was fought over the Protector's attitude towards the momentous social revolution of the sixteenth century, a movement which lay at the root of most of the internal difficulties of Tudor governments, and vitally affected the history of the reign of Edward VI. It was in effect the breaking up of the foundations upon which society had been based for five hundred years, the substitution of competition for custom as the regulating principle of the relations between the various classes of the community.

Social organisation in medieval times was essentially conservative; custom was the characteristic sanction to which appeal was universally made. Land, in the eyes of its military feudal lord, was valuable less as a source of money than as a source of men; it was not rent but service that he required, and he was seldom tempted to reduce his service-roll in order to swell his revenues. But the Black Death and the Peasants' Revolt, co-operating with more silent and gradual causes, weakened the mutual bonds of interest between landlord and tenant, while the extension of commerce produced a wealthy class which slowly gained admission into governing circles and established itself on the land. To these new landlords land was mainly an investment; they applied to it the principles they practised in trade; and sought to extract from it not men but money. They soon found that the *petite culture* of feudal times was not the most profitable use to which land could be turned; and they began the practice known as "engrossing," of which complaint was made as early as 1484 in the Lord Chancellor's speech to Parliament. Their method was to buy up several holdings, which they did not lease to so many yeomen, but consolidated, leaving the old homesteads to decay; the former tenants became either vagabonds or landless labourers, who boarded with their masters and were precluded by their position from marrying and raising families. Similarly the new landed gentry sought to turn their vague and disputed rights over common lands into palpable means of revenue. Sometimes with and often without the consent of the commoners, they proceeded to enclose vast stretches of land with a view to converting it either to tillage or to pasture. The latter proved to be the more remunerative, owing to the great development of the wool-market in the Netherlands; and it was calculated that the lord, who converted open arable land into enclosed pasture land, thereby doubled his income.

Yet another method of extracting the utmost monetary value from the land was the raising of rents; it had rarely occurred to the uncommercial feudal lord to interfere with the ancient service or rent which his tenants paid for their lands, but respect for immemorial custom counted for little against the retired trader's habit of demanding the highest price for his goods. The direct result of these tendencies was to pauperise a large section of the community, though the aggregate wealth of the whole was increased. The English yeomen, who had

supplied the backbone of English armies and the great majority of students at English Universities, were depressed into vagabonds or hired labourers. As indirect results, schools and universities declined; and foreign mercenaries took the place of English soldiers; for "shepherds" wrote a contemporary "be but ill archers."

These evils had not passed without notice from statesmen and writers in the previous reign. Wolsey, inspired perhaps by Sir Thomas More, had in 1517 made a vigorous effort to check enclosures; and More himself had sympathetically pourtrayed the grievances of the population in the pages of his *Utopia*. Later in the reign of Henry VIII remedial measures had been warmly urged by conservatives like Thomas Lupset and Thomas Starkey, and by more radical thinkers like Brynkelow and Robert Crowley. But the King and his ministers were absorbed in the task of averting foreign complications and effecting a religious revolution, while courtiers and ordinary members of Parliament were not concerned to check a movement from which they reaped substantial profit. After the accession of Edward VI the constant aggravation of the evil and the sympathy it was known to evoke in high quarters brought the question more prominently forward. The Protector himself denounced with more warmth than prudence the misdeeds of new lords "sprung from the dunghill." Latimer inveighed against them in eloquent sermons preached at Court; Scory told the young King that his subjects had become "more like the slavery and peasantry of France than the ancient and godly yeomanry of England." Cranmer, Lever, and other reforming divines held similar opinions, but the most earnest and active member of the party, which came to be known as the "Commonwealth's men," was John Hales, whose *Discourse of the Common Weal* is one of the most informing documents of the age.

The existence of this party alarmed the official class, but the Protector more or less openly adopted its social programme; and it was doubtless with his connivance that various remedial measures were introduced into Parliament in December, 1547. One bill "for bringing up poor men's children" was apparently based on a suggestion made by Brynkelow in the previous reign that a certain number of the poorest children in each town should be brought up at the expense of the community; another bill sought to give farmers and lessees security of tenure; and a third provided against the decay of tillage and husbandry. None of these bills got beyond a second reading, and the only measure which found favour with Parliament was an Act which provided that a weekly collection in churches should be made for the impotent poor, and that confirmed vagabonds might be sold into slavery.

The failure of Parliament to find adequate remedies was the signal for agrarian disturbances in Hertfordshire and other counties in the spring of 1548; and the Protector, moved thereto by divers supplications, some of which are extant, now determined to take action

independently of Parliament. On the first of June he issued a Procl mation, in which he referred to the "insatiable greediness" of those t whose means "houses were decayed, parishes diminished, the force the realm weakened, and Christian people eaten up and devoured brute beasts and driven from their houses by sheep and bullocks Commissioners were appointed to enquire into the extent of enclosur made since 1485 and the failure of previous legislation to check then and to make returns of those who broke the law.

The commissioners, of whom Hales was the chief, encountered a organised and stubborn resistance from those on whose conduct the were to report. With a view to disarming opposition, the presentmen of offenders was postponed, until evidence should have been collected t form the basis of measures to be laid before Parliament; and subse quently Hales obtained from the Protector a general pardon of th offenders presented by the commission. Both measures failed to mollif the gentry, who resolutely set themselves to burke the enquiry. The packed the juries with their own servants; they threatened to evic tenants who gave evidence against them, and even had them indicted a the assizes. Other means taken to conceal the truth were the ploughin up of one furrow in a holding enclosed to pasture, the whole being the returned as arable land, and the placing of a couple of oxen with flock of sheep and passing off the sheep-run as land devoted to fattin beasts. Under these circumstances it was with difficulty that the com missioners could get to work at all; and only those commissions o which Hales sat appear to have made any return. The opposition wa next transferred to the Houses of Parliament. In November, 154 Hales introduced various bills for maintaining tillage and husbandr for restoring tenements which had been suffered to decay, and fc checking the growth of sheep-farms. An Act was passed remitting th payment of fee-farms for three years in order that the proceeds migh be devoted to finding work for the unemployed; and a tax of twopen was imposed on every sheep kept in pasture. But the more importan bills were received with open hostility; and after acrimonious debat they were all rejected either by the Lords or by the Commons.

This result is not surprising, for the statute of 1430 had limite parliamentary representation, so far as the agricultural districts we concerned, to the landed gentry; and there are frequent complaints the time that the representation of the boroughs had also fallen mainl into the hands of capitalists, who, by engrossing household property an monopolising trade, were providing the poorer townsfolk with grievanc similar to those of the country folk. Nor was there a masterful Tudo to overawe resistance. The government was divided, for Somerset' adoption of the peasants' cause had driven the majority of the Counc into secret opposition. Warwick seized the opportunity. Hithert there had been no apparent differences between him and Somerset; bu

now his park was ploughed up as an illegal enclosure, and he fiercely attacked Hales as the cause of the agrarian discontent. Other members of the government, including even his ally Paget, remonstrated with the Protector, but without effect, except to stiffen his back and confirm him in his course. Fresh instructions were issued to the commissioners in 1549; and, having failed to obtain relief for the poor by legislation, Somerset resorted to the arbitrary expedient of erecting a sort of Court of Requests, which sat in his own house under Cecil's presidency to hear any complaint that poor suitors might bring against their oppressors.

Measures like these were of little avail to avert the dangers Somerset feared. Parliament had scarcely disposed of his bills, when the resentment of the peasants found vent in open revolt. The flame was kindled first in Somersetshire; thence it spread eastwards into Wilts and Gloucestershire, southwards into Dorset and Hampshire and northwards into Berks and the shires of Oxford and Buckingham. Surrey remained in a state of "quavering quiet"; but Kent felt the general impulse. Far in the west Cornwall and Devon rose; and in the east the men of Norfolk captured Norwich and established a "commonwealth" on Mousehold Hill, where Robert Ket, albeit himself a landlord of ancient family, laid down the law, and no rich man did what he liked with his own. The civil war, which the French king had hoped to evoke from Seymour's conspiracy, seemed to have come at last, and with it the opportunity of France. On August 8, 1549, at Whitehall Palace, the French ambassador made a formal declaration of war.

The successful Chauvinist policy of the French government would have precipitated a conflict long before but for the efforts of the English to avoid it. Henry II had begun his reign by breaking off the negotiations for an alliance with England, and declining to ratify the arrangement which the English and French commissioners had drawn up for the delimitation of the Boulonnais. But a variety of circumstances induced him to modify for a time his martial ardour, and restrict his hostility to a policy of pin-pricks administered to the English in their French possessions. The complete defeat of the German Princes at Muhlberg (April, 1547) made Henry anxious as to the direction in which the Emperor would turn his victorious arms; and the rout of the Scots at Pinkie five months later inspired a wholesome respect for English power. Then, in 1548, Guienne broke out in revolt against the *gabelle*, and clamoured for the privileges it had once enjoyed under its English kings. Charles V, moreover, although he disliked the religious changes in England and declined to take any active part against the Scots, gave the French to understand that he considered the Scots his enemies. Somerset, meanwhile, did his best to keep on friendly terms with Charles, and sought to mitigate his dislike of the First Act of Uniformity by granting the Princess Mary a dispensation to hear mass in private. Unless the Emperor's attention was absorbed elsewhere,

a French attack on England might provoke an imperial onslaught on France.

Still, the endless bickerings with France about Boulogne were very exasperating; and eventually the Protector offered to restore it at once for the sum stipulated in the treaty of 1546, if France would further the marriage between Edward VI and Mary, Queen of Scots. That, however, was the last thing to which the Guises would consent; the preservation of their influence in Scotland was at that moment the mainspring of their action and the chief cause of the quarrel with England. The only condition on which they would keep the peace was the abandonment of Scotland to their designs, and that condition the Protector refused to the last to grant. Before the end of June, 1549, the French had assumed so threatening an attitude that Somerset sent Paget to Charles V with proposals for the marriage of the Princess Mary with the Infante John of Portugal, for the delivery of Boulogne into the Emperor's hands, and for a joint invasion of France by Imperial and English armies. This embassy seems to have alarmed Henry II, and he at once appointed commissioners to settle the disputes in the Boulonnais. The Protector thereupon forbade Paget to proceed with the negotiations for a joint invasion. The Emperor at the same time, doubtful of the value of England's alliance in her present disturbed condition, and immersed in anxieties of his own, declined to undertake the burden of Boulogne, or to knit any closer his ties with England. This refusal encouraged the French king to begin hostilities. He had collected an army on the borders of the Boulonnais; and in August it crossed the frontier. Ambleteuse (Newhaven) was captured through treachery; Blackness was taken by assault; Boulogneberg was dismantled and abandoned by the English; and the French forces sat down to besiege Boulogne.

The success of the French was mainly due to England's domestic troubles. Levies which had been raised for service in France were diverted to Devon or Norfolk. Fortunately, both these revolts were crushed before the war with France had lasted a fortnight. The rising in the west, for which religion had furnished a pretext and enclosures the material, died away after the fight at the Barns of Crediton, and the relief of Exeter by Russell on August 9. The eastern rebels, who were stirred solely by social grievances, caused more alarm; and a suspicion lest the Princess Mary should be at their back gave some of the Council sleepless nights. The Marquis of Northampton was driven out of Norwich, and the restraint and orderliness of the rebels' proceedings secured them a good deal of sympathy in East Anglia. Warwick, however, to whom the command was now entrusted, was a soldier of real ability, and with the help of Italian and Spanish mercenaries he routed the insurgents on August 26 at the battle of Dussindale, near Mousehold Hill. His victory made Warwick the hero of the gentlemen

of England. He had always opposed the Protector's agrarian schemes, and he was now in a position to profit by their failure.

The revolts had placed Somerset in a predicament from which a modern minister would have sought refuge in resignation. His sympathy with the insurgents weakened his action against them; and his readiness to pardon and reluctance to proscribe exasperated most of his colleagues. He was still obstinate in his assertion of the essential justice of the rebels' complaints, and was believed to be planning for the approaching meeting of Parliament more radical measures of redress than had yet been laid before it. Paget wrote in alarm lest far-reaching projects should be rashly adopted which required ten years' deliberation; and other officials made Cecil the recipient of fearful warnings against the designs of the "Commonwealth's men." The Council and the governing classes generally were in no mood for measures of conciliation, and disasters abroad and disorders at home afforded a good pretext for removing the man to whom it was convenient to ascribe them.

The malcontents found an excellent party-leader in Warwick; few men in English history have shown a greater capacity for subtle intrigue or smaller respect for principle. A brilliant soldier, a skilful diplomatist, and an accomplished man of the world, he was described at the time as the modern Alcibiades. No one could better turn to his own purposes the passions and interests of others, or throw away his tools with less compunction when they had served his end. Masking profound ambitions under the guise of the utmost deference to his colleagues, he never at the time of his greatest influence attempted to claim a position of formal superiority. Afterwards, when he was practically ruler of England, he sat only fourth in the order of precedence at the Council-board; and content with the substance of power, he eschewed such titles as Protector of the Realm or Governor of the King's person.

In the general feeling of discontent he had little difficulty in uniting various sections in an attack on the Protector. The public at large were put in mind of Somerset's ill-success abroad; the landed gentry needed no reminder of his attempts to check their enclosures. Protestant zealots recalled his slackness in dealing with Mass-priests, and Catholics hated his Prayer Book. Hopes were held out to all; Gardiner in the Tower expected his release; Bonner appealed against his deprivation; and Southampton made sure of being restored to the woolsack. Privy Councillors had private griefs as well as public grounds to allege; the Protector had usurped his position in defiance of Henry's will; he had neglected their advice and browbeaten them when they remonstrated; he consulted and enriched only his chosen friends; Somerset House was erected, but Warwick's parks were ploughed up.

It was at Warwick's and Southampton's houses in Holborn that the plot against the Protector was hatched in September, 1549; and the immediate excuse for his deposition appears to have been the abandonment,

after a brave defence, of Haddington, the chief English stronghold in Scotland (September 14). Somerset had left Westminster on the 12th with the King and removed to Hampton Court; Cranmer, Paget, St John, the two Secretaries of State, Petre and Sir Thomas Smith, and the Protector's own Secretary, Cecil, remained with him till the beginning of October; but the rest of the Council secretly gathered in London and collected their retainers. The aldermen of the City were on their side, but the apprentices and poorer classes generally adhered to the Protector. One of Warwick's methods of enlisting the support of the army was to send their captains to Somerset with petitions for higher pay than he knew the Protector could grant. The Duke apparently suspected nothing, unless suspicion be traced in the "matter of importance" to which he referred in his letter of the 27th, urging Russell and Herbert to hasten their return from the west. But by the 3rd or 4th of October rumours of what was happening reached him. On the latter day that "crafty fox Shebna," as Knox called St John, deserted to his colleagues in London, and secured the Tower by displacing Somerset's friends. On the 6th Somerset sent Petre to demand an explanation of the Council's conduct; but Petre did not return.

The Protector now thought of raising the masses against the classes. Handbills were distributed inciting the commons to rise in his defence; extortioners and "great masters" were conspiring, they were told, against the Protector because he had procured the peasants their pardon. On the night of the 6th he hurried the King to Windsor for the sake of greater security. But either he repented of his efforts to stir a social war, or he saw that they would be futile; for in a letter to the Council on the 7th he offered to submit upon reasonable conditions drawn up by representatives of both parties. The Council in London delayed their answer until they had heard from Russell and Herbert, to whom both parties had appealed for help. The commanders of the western army were at Wilton, and their action would decide the issue of peace or war. They promptly strengthened their forces, and moved up to Andover. There they found the country in a general uproar; five or six thousand men from the neighbouring counties were preparing to march to Somerset's aid. But Russell and Herbert were disgusted with the Protector's inflammatory appeals to the turbulent commons; they threw the whole weight of their influence on the Council's side, and succeeded in quieting the commotion, reporting their measures to both the rival factions.

On receipt of this intelligence the Lords in London brushed aside the conciliatory pleas of the King, Cranmer, Paget, and Smith, and took steps to effect the Protector's arrest. They were aided by treacherous advice from Paget, who purchased his own immunity at the expense of his colleagues. In accordance probably with Paget's suggestions, Sir Philip Hoby was sent to Windsor on the 10th with solemn promises from the

Council that the Duke should suffer no loss in lands, goods, or honours, and that his adherents should not be deprived of their offices. On the delivery of this message Paget fell on his knees before the Protector, and, with tears in his eyes, besought him to avail himself of the Council's merciful disposition. The others, relieved of their apprehensions, wept for joy and counselled submission. Somerset then gave way; and, through the "diligent travail" of Cranmer and Paget, his servants were removed from attendance on the King's person. When this measure had been effected, the Council no longer considered itself bound to observe the promises by which it had induced the Protector and his adherents to submit. Wingfield, St Leger, and Williams were sent with an armed force to arrest them all except Cranmer and Paget. On the 12th the whole Council went down to Windsor to complete the revolution. Somerset was conveyed to London, paraded as a prisoner through the streets, and shut up in the Tower; Smith was deprived of the secretaryship, expelled from the Council, and also sent to the Tower; and a like fate befell the rest of those who had remained faithful to the Protector. Of the victors, Warwick resumed the office of Lord High Admiral, which had been vacant since Seymour's attainder; Dr Nicholas Wotton, who was also Dean of Canterbury and of York, succeeded Smith as Secretary; and Paget received a peerage in reward for his services. The distribution of the more important offices was deferred until it was settled which section of the Protector's opponents was to have the upper hand in the new government. For the present it was advisable to meet Parliament with as united a front as possible, in order to secure its sanction for the Protector's deposition, and its reversal of so much of his policy as both sections agreed in detesting.

On the broader aspects of that policy there was not much difference of opinion. Most people of influence distrusted that liberty on which Somerset set so much store. Sir John Mason, for instance, an able and educated politician, described his repeal of Henry VIII's laws concerning verbal treason as the worst act done in that generation, and in accordance with this view a bill was introduced declaring it felony to preach and hold "divers" opinions. Differences about the definition of the offence apparently caused this bill to fail; but measures sufficiently drastic were passed to stifle any opposition to the new government. Ministers sought to perpetuate their tenure of office by making it high treason for anyone to attempt to turn them out. That tremendous penalty, the heaviest known to the law, had hitherto been reserved for offences against the sacrosanct persons of royalty; it was now employed to protect those who wielded royal authority. It became high treason for twelve or more persons to meet with the object of killing or even imprisoning a member of the Privy Council—an unparalleled enactment which, had it been retrospective, would have rendered the Privy Council itself liable to a charge of treason for its action against the Protector. The same clause

imposed the same penalty upon persons assembling for the purpose of "altering the laws"; and the Act also omitted the safeguards Somerset had provided against the abuse of such treason laws as he had left on the Statute-book; it contained no clause limiting the time within which charges of treason were to be preferred or requiring the evidence of two witnesses.

The fact that this Act did not pass until it had been read six times in the Commons and six times in the Lords may indicate that it encountered considerable opposition; but there was probably little hesitation in reversing the Protector's agrarian policy. Parliament was not indeed content with that; it met (November 4, 1549) in a spirit of exasperation and revenge, and it went back, not only upon the radical proposals of Somerset, but also upon the whole tenour of Tudor land legislation. Enclosures had been forbidden again and again; they were now expressly declared to be legal; and Parliament enacted that lords of the manor might "approve themselves of their wastes, woods, and pastures notwithstanding the gainsaying and contradiction of their tenants." In order that the process might be without let or hindrance, it was made treason for forty, and felony for twelve, persons to meet for the purpose of breaking down any enclosure or enforcing any right of way; to summon such an assembly or incite to such an act was also felony; and any copyholder refusing to help in repressing it forfeited his copyhold for life. The same penalty was attached to hunting in any enclosure and to assembling with the object of abating rents or the price of corn; but the prohibition against capitalists conspiring to raise prices was repealed, and so were the taxes which Somerset had imposed on sheep and woollen cloths. The masses had risen against the classes, and the classes took their revenge.

This, however, was not the kind of reaction most desired by the Catholics who, led by Southampton, had assisted Warwick to overthrow Somerset. Southampton was moved by private grudges, but he also desired a return to Catholic usages or at least a pause in the process of change; and for a time it seemed that his party might prevail. "Those cruel beasts, the Romanists," wrote one evangelical divine, were already beginning to triumph, to revive the Mass, and to threaten faithful servants of Christ with the fate of the fallen Duke. They were, said another, struggling earnestly for their kingdom, and even Parliament felt it necessary to denounce rumours that the old Latin service and superstitious uses would be restored. Southampton was one of the six lords to whose charge the person of the King was specially entrusted; the Earl of Arundel was another, and Southwell reappeared at the Council board. Bonner had been deprived by Cranmer in September; but no steps were taken to find a successor, and the decision might yet be reversed. Gardiner petitioned for release, while Hooper thought himself in the greatest peril.

So the balance trembled. But Southampton was no match for "that most faithful and intrepid soldier of Christ," as Hooper styled Warwick. "England," he went on, "cannot do without him." Neither could the Earl afford to discard such zealous adherents as the Reformers; in them he found his main support. They compared him with Moses and Joshua, and described him and Dorset as "the two most shining lights of the Church of England." They believed that Somerset had been deposed for his slackness in the cause of religious persecution; Warwick resolved to run no such risk. The tendency towards religious change, which Henry VIII had failed to stop, was still strong, and Warwick threw himself into the stream. Privately he seems, if he believed in anything, to have favoured Catholic doctrines; and the consciousness of his insincerity made him all the louder in his professions of Protestant zeal, and all the more eager to push to extremes the principles of the Reformers. He became, in Hooper's words, "a most holy and fearless instrument of the Word of God."

But this policy could not be combined with the conciliation of Catholics; and the coalition which had driven Somerset from power fell asunder, as soon as its immediate object had been achieved, and it was called upon to formulate a policy of its own. Southampton ceased to attend the Council after October; and Parliament, which had completely reversed the Protector's liberal and social programme, effected almost as great a change in the methods and aims of his religious policy. The direction may have been the same, but it is pure assumption to suppose that the Protector would have gone so far as his successors or employed the same violence to attain his ends. The difference in character between the two administrators was vividly illustrated in the session of Parliament which began a month after the change. Under Somerset there had always been a good attendance of Bishops, and a majority of them had voted for all his religious proposals; at the opening of the first session after his fall there were only nine Bishops, and a majority of them voted against two of the three measures of ecclesiastical importance passed during its course. One was the Act for the destruction of all service books other than the Book of Common Prayer and Henry's Primer; and the other was a renewal of the provision for the reform of Canon Law. A majority of Bishops voted for the bill appointing a commission to draw up a new Ordinal, but, when they complained that their jurisdiction was despised and drafted a bill for its restoration, the measure was rejected.

The prorogation of Parliament (February, 1550) was followed by the final overthrow of the Catholic party and the complete establishment of Warwick's control over the government. He had already begun to pack the Council, which had remained practically unchanged since Henry's death, by adding to it five of his own adherents. Southampton was now expelled from the Council, Arundel was deprived of his office of Lord Chamberlain, and Southwell was sent to the Tower. The offices vacated

by the Catholic lords and Somerset's party were distributed among Warwick's friends. St John became Earl of Wiltshire and Lord High Treasurer; Warwick succeeded him as Lord Great Master of the Household and President of the Council; and Northampton succeeded Warwick as Great Chamberlain of England. Arundel's office of Chamberlain of the Household was conferred on Wentworth, and Paget's Comptrollership on Wingfield; Russell was created Earl of Bedford, and Herbert was made President of the Council of Wales.

The new government now felt firm in the saddle, and it proceeded to turn its attention to foreign affairs. His failure abroad had been the chief ostensible reason for Somerset's downfall, but his successors had done nothing to redeem their implied promise of amendment. In spite of the fact that the agrarian insurrections—the immediate cause of the Protector's reverses in France and Scotland—had been suppressed, and large bodies of troops thus set free for service elsewhere, not a place had been recaptured in France, and in Scotland nearly all the English strongholds fell during the winter into the enemy's hands. The Council preferred peace to an attempt to retrieve their fortunes by war; and early in 1550 Warwick made secret overtures to Henry II. The French pushed their advantage to the uttermost; and the peace concluded in March was the most ignominious treaty signed by England during the century.

Boulogne, which was to have been restored four years later for 800,000 crowns, was surrendered for half that sum. All English strongholds in Scotland were to be given up without compensation; England bound itself to make no war on that country unless fresh grounds of offence were given, and condoned the marriage of Mary to the Dauphin of France. The net result was the abandonment of the whole Tudor policy towards Scotland, the destruction of English influence across the Border, and the establishment of French control in Edinburgh. Henry II began to speak of himself as King of Scotland; it was as much subject to him, he said, as France itself; and he boasted that by this peace he had now added to these two realms a third, namely England, of whose King, subjects, and resources he had such absolute disposal that the three might be reckoned as one kingdom of which he was King. To make himself yet more secure, he began a policy of active, though secret, intervention in Ireland. Had he succeeded in this, he would really have held England in the hollow of his hand; had a son been born to Mary Stewart and Francis II, England might even have become a French province. Fortunately, the accession of Mary Tudor broke the French ring which girt England round about; but it was certainly not Warwick's merit that England was delivered from perhaps the most pressing foreign danger with which she was ever threatened.

While, however, the policy which Warwick adopted involved a reversal of the time-honoured Burgundian alliance and a criminal

neglect of England's ultimate interests, its immediate effects were undeniably advantageous to the government. It was at once relieved from the pressure of war on two fronts, and an intolerable drain on the exchequer was stopped. Security from foreign interference afforded an excuse for reducing expenditure on armaments and military forces, and even for seriously impairing the effective strength of the navy, the creation of which had been Henry VIII's least questionable achievement; and the Council was left free to pursue its religious policy, even to the persecution of the Princess Mary, without fear of interruption from her cousin the Emperor. The alliance of England, Scotland, and France was a combination which Charles could not afford to attack, more particularly when the league between Henry II, Maurice of Saxony, and the reviving Protestant Princes in Germany gave him more than enough to do to defend himself. France, the persecutor of heresy at home, lent her support to the English government while it pursued its campaign against Roman doctrine, just as she had countenanced Henry VIII while he was uprooting the Roman jurisdiction.

The path of the government was thus made easy abroad; but at home it was crowded with difficulties. The diversity of religious opinion, which Henry VIII's severity had only checked and Somerset's lenience had encouraged, grew ever more marked. The New Learning was, in the absence of effective opposition, carrying all before it in the large cities; and the more trenchantly a preacher denounced the old doctrines, the greater were the crowds which gathered to hear him. The favourite divine in London was Hooper, who went far beyond anything which the Council had yet done or at present intended. Between twenty and thirty editions of the Bible had appeared since the beginning of the reign, and nearly all were made vehicles, by their annotations, of attacks on Catholic dogma. Altars, images, painted glass windows became the object of a popular violence which the Council was unable, even if it was willing, to restrain; and the parochial clergy indulged in a ritual lawlessness which the Bishops encouraged or checked according to their own individual preferences. That the majority of the nation disliked both these changes and their method may perhaps be assumed, but the men of the Old Learning made little stand against the men of the New. In a revolution the first advantage generally lies with the aggressors. The Catholics had not been rallied, nor the Counter-Reformation organised, and their natural leaders had been silenced for their opposition to the government. But there were deeper causes at work; the Catholic Church had latterly denied to the laity any voice in the determination of Catholic doctrine; but now the laity had been called in to decide. Discussion had descended from Court and from senate into the street, where only one of the parties was adequately equipped for the contest. Catholics still were content to do as they had been taught and to leave the matter to the clergy; they were ill fitted

to cope with antagonists who regarded theology as a matter for private judgment, and had by study of the Scriptures to some extent prepared themselves for its exercise. The authority of the Church, to which Catholics bowed, had suffered many rude shocks; and in the appeal to the Scriptures they were no match for the zeal and conviction of their opponents.

Under the circumstances it might seem that the Council would have done well to resort to some of Henry VIII's methods for enforcing uniformity; and indeed both parties agreed in demanding greater rigour. But they could not agree on the question to whom the rigour should be applied; their contentions indirectly tended towards the emancipation of conscience from the control of authority, though such a solution seemed shocking alike to those who believed in the Royal and to those who believed in the Papal Supremacy. There was no course open to the government that would have satisfied all contemporary or modern critics. England was in the throes of a revolution in which no government could have maintained perfect order or avoided all persecution. The Council's policy lacked the extreme moderation and humanity of Somerset's rule, but it averted open disruption, and did so at the cost of less rigour than characterised the rule of Henry VIII, of Mary, or of Elizabeth.

At one end of the religious scale Joan Bocher, whom Somerset had left in prison after her condemnation by the ecclesiastical Courts in the hope that she might be converted, was burnt in May, 1550; and a year later another heretic, George van Paris, suffered a similar fate. Against Roman Catholics the penalties of the first Act of Uniformity now began to be enforced; but they were limited to clerical offenders and of these there seem to have been comparatively few Dr Cole was expelled from the Wardenship of New College, and Dr Morwen, President of Corpus Christi, Oxford, was sent for a time to the Fleet; two divines, Crispin and Moreman, who had been implicated in the Cornish rebellion, were confined in the Tower; two of Gardiner's chaplains, Seton and Watson, are said to have been subjected to some restraint; four others, John Boxall, afterwards Queen Mary's Secretary, William Rastell, More's nephew, Nicholas Harpsfield and Dr Richard Smith, whose recantations were as numerous as his apologies for the Catholic faith, fled to Flanders; and these, with Cardinal Pole, whose attainder was not reversed, make up the list of those who are said by Roman martyrologists to have suffered for their belief in the reign of Edward VI. To them, however, must be added five or six Bishops, who were deposed. Bonner was the only Bishop deprived in 1550, but in the following year Gardiner, Heath of Worcester, Day of Chichester, and Voysey of Exeter all vacated their sees, and Tunstall of Durham was sent to the Tower. Their places were filled with zealous Reformers; Coverdale became Bishop of Exeter, Ridley succeeded Bonner at London, and Ponet took Ridley's see; Ponet was soon transferred to Gardiner's seat at Winchester, and Scory supplied

: place left vacant by Ponet, but was almost at once translated to
y's bishopric at Chichester. Warwick wished to enthrone John Knox
Rochester as a whetstone to Cranmer, but the Scottish Reformer
ved ungrateful; and Rochester, which had seen five Bishops in as
ny years, remained vacant to the end of the reign.

The most remarkable of these creations and translations, which were
de by letters patent, was perhaps the elevation of Hooper to the
of Gloucester. Hooper had, after a course of Zwinglian theology at
rich, become chaplain to the Protector on the eve of his fall; but he
nd a more powerful friend in Warwick, who made him Lent preacher
Court in February, 1550. He was one of those zealous and guileless
formers in whom Warwick found his choicest instruments; he combined
ent denunciations of the evils of the times with extravagant admira-
ı for the man in whom they were most strikingly personified; and,
oon as his Lenten sermons were finished, he was offered the See of
ucester. He declined it from scruples about the new Ordinal, the
h invoking the Saints, and the episcopal vestments. After a nine
ths' controversy, in which the whole bench of Bishops, with Bucer and
rtyr, were arrayed against him and only John à Lasco and Micronius
eared on his side, and after some weeks' confinement in the Fleet,
oper allowed himself to be consecrated. The simultaneous vacancy
Worcester enabled the Council to sweep away one of Henry VIII's
bishoprics by uniting it with Gloucester; and another was abolished
the translation of Thirlby from Westminster to Norwich, and the
ion of the former see with London.

These episcopal changes afforded scope for another sort of ecclesiastical
iation; most of the new Bishops were compelled to alienate some of
r manors to courtiers as the price of their elevation; and Ponet went
ar as to surrender all his lands in return for a fixed stipend of two
usand marks. These lands were for the most part distributed
ng Warwick's adherents; and no small portion of the chantry
owments and much Church plate found its way to the same destination.
ıerset had issued a commission in 1547 for taking a general inventory
Church goods in order to prevent the private embezzling which was so
ımon just before and during the course of the Reformation; and this
ısure was supplemented by various orders to particular persons
corporations to restore such plate and ornaments as they had
ropriated. But it may be doubted whether these prohibitions were
effectual; and after Somerset's fall private and public spoliation
t on rapidly until it culminated (March, 1551) in a comprehensive
ure by the government of all such Church plate as remained
ppropriated.

The confiscation of chantry lands followed a similar course. The
charge upon them was the support of the displaced chantry priests,
se pensions in 1549 amounted to a sum equivalent to between two

and three hundred thousand pounds in modern currency. The next was stated to be "the erecting of Grammar schools to the education of youth in virtue and godliness, the further augmenting of the Universities, and better provision for the poor and needy." But the bill introduced into Parliament in 1549 "for the making of schools" failed to pass the House of Lords; and the "further order" designed by the Protector was inevitably postponed. Meanwhile the confiscated chantry lands afforded tempting facilities for the satisfaction of the King's immediate needs. In 1548–9 some five thousand pounds' worth were sold and the proceeds devoted to the defence of the realm. But less legitimate practices soon obtained; the chantry lands were regarded as the last dish in the last course of the feast provided by the wealth of the Church, and the importunity of courtiers correspondingly increased. Grants as well as sales became common; the recipients, with few exceptions, repudiated the obligation to provide for schools out of their newly-won lands; and the fortunes of many private families were raised on funds intended for national education. A few schools were founded by private benefactors, and it is probable that education gained on the whole by its emancipation from the control of the Church. But it was not until the closing years of the reign that the government made a serious endeavour to secure the adequate maintenance of those schools whose foundations had been shaken by the abolition of chantries; and Edward VI's services to education consisted principally in assigning a fixed annual pension to schools whose endowments of much greater potential value had been appropriated.

These proceedings, like the other religious changes made during 1550 and 1551, were effected by the action of the Council, of individual Bishops, or of private persons; for Parliament, which Warwick distrusted, did not meet between February, 1550, and January, 1552. But some of the Council's measures were based upon legislation passed in the session of 1549–50; such were the wholesale destruction of old service-books which wrought particular havoc among the libraries of Oxford and Cambridge, and the compilation and execution of the new Ordinal, which was published in March and brought into use in April, 1550. By it a number of ceremonies hitherto used at ordinations were discontinued; and it embodied a clause which has been divergently interpreted both as abolishing and as retaining all the minor orders beneath that of deacon. Ridley signalised his elevation to the see of London by a severe visitation of his diocese, and by reducing the altars in St Paul's and elsewhere to the status and estimation of "the Lord's tables." Corpus Christi Day and many Saints' days ceased to be observed partly because they savoured of popery, and partly because the cessation of work impeded the acquisition of wealth. Cranmer, Bucer, and Martyr were secretly busy revising the Prayer-Book, and the Council was engaged in an attempt to force the Princess Mary to

relinquish her private masses, when suddenly in the autumn of 1551 the nation was startled by the news of another Court revolution.

Somerset, after his submission and deposition from the Protectorate, had been released from the Tower on February 6, 1550. In April he was readmitted to the Privy Council; and in May he was made a gentleman of the privy chamber and received back such of his lands as had not already been sold. The Duke's easy-going nature induced him readily to forgive the indignities he had suffered at Warwick's hands; and in June, 1550, the reconciliation went so far that a marriage was concluded between the Duke's daughter and Warwick's eldest son, Lord Lisle. From this time Somerset, to all appearance, took an active part in the government. But it was clear that he only existed on sufferance, as a dependant of the Earl of Warwick. The situation was too galling to last long. The Duke was allowed no free access to his royal nephew; he was excluded from the innermost secrets of the ruling faction, and was often dependent for knowledge of the government's plans on such information as he could extract from attendants on the King; he was not only opposed to almost every principle on which Warwick acted, but was personally an obstacle to the achievement of the designs which the Earl was beginning to cherish. He was thus, unless he was willing to be Warwick's tool, forced to become the centre of active or passive resistance—the leader of the opposition, in so far as Tudor practice tolerated such a personage. Within three months of his readmission to the Council he was exerting himself to procure the release of Gardiner, of the Earl of Arundel, and of other prisoners in the Tower; and, while Warwick was absent, Somerset was strong enough to obtain the Council's promotion or restoration of several of his adherents. He attempted to prevent the withdrawal of the Princess Mary's licence to hear mass, and sought so far as he could to restore a friendly feeling between England and the Emperor. In these efforts he found considerable support among the moderate party; and the spiritless conduct of foreign affairs by the new government, coupled with the harshness of its domestic administration, made many regret the Protector's deposition. Before the session of 1549–50 broke up, a movement was initiated for his restoration; the project was defeated by a prorogation, but it was resolved to renew it as soon as Parliament met again, and this was one of the reasons why Parliament was not summoned till after Somerset's death.

Warwick viewed the Duke's conduct with anger, which increased as his own growing unpopularity made Somerset appear more and more formidable; and before the end of September, 1551, Warwick had elaborated a comprehensive scheme for the further advancement of himself and his faction and for the total ruin of Somerset and the opposition. Cecil, the ablest of the ex-Protector's friends, had ingratiated himself with Warwick by his zeal against Gardiner at the time when Somerset was

endeavouring to procure his release, and in September, 1550, he had been sworn one of the two Secretaries of State; a year later (October 4, 1551) he occurs among the list of Warwick's supporters marked out for promotion. Warwick himself was created Duke of Northumberland; Grey, Marquis of Dorset, became Duke of Suffolk; Wiltshire Marquis of Winchester; Herbert Earl of Pembroke; while knighthoods were bestowed on Cecil, Sidney (Warwick's son-in-law), Henry Dudley (his kinsman), and Henry Neville. On the 16th Somerset and his friends, including Lord Grey de Wilton, the Earl of Arundel, and a dozen others, were arrested and sent to the Tower; Paget had been sequestered a fortnight earlier, to get him out of the way.

The real cause and occasion of this sudden *coup d'état* are still obscure. It is probable that foreign affairs had more to do with the matter than appears on the surface. The Constable of France, when informed of it, suggested that Charles V and the Princess Mary were probably at Somerset's back, and offered to send French troops to Northumberland's aid, it is quite as likely that Henry II was at the bottom of Northumberland's action. Somerset had, since the days when he served in the Emperor's suite, been an imperialist; and Charles V, who still professed a personal friendship for him, would have welcomed his return to power in place of the Francophil administration, which had just (June, 1551) put the seal on its foreign policy by negotiating a marriage between Edward VI and Henry II's daughter, Elizabeth. The dispute with the Emperor concerning the treatment of the Princess Mary was at its height; and it is possible that plot and counterplot were in essence a struggle between French and Imperial influence in England. In any case the stories told to the young King and published abroad were obviously false; Edward was informed that his uncle had plotted the murder of Northumberland, Northampton, and Pembroke, the seizure of the Crown and other measures against himself, to which the young King's knowledge of the fate of Edward V would give a sinister interpretation; the people of London were informed that he meant to destroy the city.

The plot was said to have been hatched in April, 1551; but the first hint of its existence was conveyed to the government in a private conversation between Northumberland and Sir Thomas Palmer on October 4, long after the conspiracy, if it ever was real, had been abandoned. Palmer, who was one of the accomplices, was nevertheless left at liberty for a fortnight; he was never put upon his trial, and, when Somerset was finally disposed of, he became Northumberland's right-hand man; finally, he confessed before his death that his accusation had been invented at Northumberland's instigation. The Earl of Arundel, who, according to Northumberland's theory, had been the principal accomplice in Somerset's felony, was subsequently readmitted to the Council, became Lord Steward of the Household to Mary and to Elizabeth, and

Chancellor of the University of Oxford. Paget, at whose house the intended assassination was to have taken place, was never brought into Court; neither was Lord Grey, another accomplice, who was afterwards made captain of Guines "as amends" for the unjust charge. To the minor conspirators a very simple principle was applied quite irrespective of their guilt: if they implicated Somerset, they were released without trial; if they persisted in asserting their own and his innocence they were executed. But, in spite of all Northumberland's efforts, no confirmation was obtained of Palmer's main charge. Scores of witnesses were imprisoned in the Tower and put to torture; but the story of the intended assassination was so baseless that the charge did not appear in any one of the five indictments returned against Somerset, and was not so much as alluded to in the examinations of the Duke himself and his chief adherents.

Meanwhile, stringent measures were taken to prevent disturbance. The creation of Lords-Lieutenant put local administration and the local militia into the hands of Northumberland's friends, and provided him with an instrument akin to Cromwell's Major-generals. London was overawed by the newly-organised bands of *gens d'armes*; and an effort was made to appease one source of dissatisfaction by proclaiming a new and purified coinage. Parliament, which was to have met in November, was further prorogued; and Northumberland's control of the government was strengthened by a decision that the King's order (he was just fourteen) should be absolutely valid without the countersignature of a single member of the Council. Lord-Chancellor Rich resigned soon after in alarm at this violent measure, and he consequently took no part in Somerset's trial. The tribunal consisted of twenty-six out of forty-seven peers; among them were Northumberland, Northampton, and Pembroke, who were really parties in the case. They had already acted practically as accusers, had drawn up the charges, and examined the witnesses; they now assumed the function of judges, and after their verdict determined whether it should be executed or not.

The trial took place on December 1 at Westminster Hall; the charges were practically two, one of treason in conspiring to imprison a Privy Councillor, and one of felony in inciting to an unlawful assembly. Both these offences depended upon the atrocious statute which, passed in the panic of reaction after Somerset's fall, was to expire with the next session of Parliament—a further reason for its prorogation. In another respect the trial would not have been possible under any other Act; for that Act removed the previous limitation of thirty days within which accusations must be preferred, and five months had elapsed between Somerset's alleged offences and Palmer's accusation. Nevertheless the charge of treason bròke down, and the government boasted of its magnanimity in condemning the prisoner to death only for felony. There was as little evidence for that offence as for the other, and the

sum of the ex-Protector's guilt appears to have been this: he had spoken to one or two friends of the advisability of arresting Northumberland, Northampton, and Pembroke, calling a Parliament, and demanding an account of their evil government.

Somerset was sent back to the Tower amid extravagant demonstrations of joy by the people, who thought he had been acquitted. He remained there seven weeks, and there was a general expectation that no further steps would be taken against him. Parliament, however, was to meet on January 23, and it was certain that a movement in Somerset's favour would be made. Northumberland had endeavoured to strengthen his faction in the Commons by forcing his nominees on vacant constituencies; but his hold on Parliament remained nevertheless weaker than that of his rival, and it was therefore determined to get rid of Somerset once and for all. An order of the King drawn up on January 18 for the trial of Somerset's accomplices, was, before its submission to the Council on the following day, transformed by erasures and interlineations into an order for the Duke's execution. No record of the proceedings was entered in the Council's register; but Cecil, with a view to future contingencies, secured the King's memorandum and inscribed on the back of it the names of the Councillors who were present. Somerset's execution took place at sunrise on the 22nd: in spite of elaborate precautions a riot nearly broke out, but the Duke made no effort to turn to account the popular sympathy. He had resigned himself to his fate, and died with exemplary courage and dignity.

Parliament met on the following day, and it soon proved that Northumberland had been wise in his generation. Parliament could not restore Somerset to life, but it could at least ensure that no one should again be condemned by similar methods. It rejected a new treason bill designed to supply the place of the former expiring Act, and passed another providing that accusations must be made within three months of the offence, and that the prisoner must be confronted with two witnesses to his crime. The House of Commons also refused to pass a bill of attainder against Tunstall, Bishop of Durham, who had been imprisoned on a vague charge remotely connected with Somerset's pretended plots. His bishopric was, however, marked out for spoliation, and a few months later Tunstall was deprived by a civil Court. Parliament was more complaisant in religious matters, and passed the Second Act of Uniformity, besides another Act removing from the marriage of priests the stigma hitherto attaching to the practice as being only a licensed evil. The Second Act of Uniformity extended the scope of religious persecution by imposing penalties for recusancy upon laymen; if they neglected to attend common prayer on Sundays and holidays, they were to be subject to ecclesiastical censures and excommunication; if they attended any but the authorised form of worship, they were liable to six months'

imprisonment for the first offence, a year's imprisonment for the second, and lifelong imprisonment for the third.

This Second Act of Uniformity also imposed a Second Book of Common Prayer. The First Book of Common Prayer had scarcely received the sanction of Parliament in 1549, when it began to be attacked as a halting makeshift by the Reformers. The fact that Gardiner expressed a modified approval of it was enough to condemn it in their eyes, and in the Second Book those parts which had won Gardiner's approval were carefully eliminated or revised. The Prayer Book of 1549 was elaborately examined by Bucer and more superficially by Peter Martyr; but the changes actually made were rather on lines indicated by Cranmer in his controversy with Gardiner than on those suggested by Bucer; and the actual revision was done by the Archbishop, assisted at times by Ridley. There is no proof that Convocation was consulted in the matter, nor is there any evidence that the Book underwent modification in its passage through Parliament. The net result was to minimise the possibility of such Catholic interpretations as had been placed on the earlier Book; in particular the Communion Office was radically altered until it approached very nearly to the Zwinglian idea of a commemorative rite. The celebrated Black Rubric, explaining away the significance of the ceremony of kneeling at Communion, was inserted on the Council's authority after the Act had been passed by Parliament. Two other ecclesiastical measures of importance were the *Reformatio legum ecclesiasticarum* and the compilation of the Forty-two Articles. The Articles of Religion, originally drawn up by Cranmer, were revised at the Council's direction and did not receive the royal signature until June, 1553, while Parliament in the same year refused its sanction to the Book of Canon Law prepared by the commissioners; lay objections to spiritual jurisdiction were the same, whether it was exercised by Catholic or by Protestant prelates.

The extensive reduction of Church ritual effected by the Second Act of Uniformity rendered superfluous a large quantity of Church property, and for its seizure by the Crown the government's financial embarrassments supplied an obvious motive. The subsidies granted in 1549-50, the money paid for the restitution of Boulogne, profits made by the debasement of the coinage, and other sources, had enabled Northumberland to tide over the Parliament of 1552, without demanding from it any further financial aid. But these sources were now exhausted, and in the ensuing summer the final gleanings from the Church were gathered in. Such chantry lands as had not been sold or granted away were now disposed of; all unnecessary church ornaments were appropriated; the lands of the dissolved bishoprics and attainted conspirators were placed on the market; church bells were taken down, organs were removed, and lead was stripped off the roofs. When these means failed, the heroic measure was proposed of demanding an account from all Crown officers

of moneys received during the last twenty years. Still there was a deficit; and in the winter Northumberland was reduced to appealing to Parliament.

By this time his government had become so unpopular that he shrank from meeting a really representative assembly, and had recourse to an expedient which has been misrepresented as the normal practice of Tudor times. There had already been isolated instances of the exercise of government influence to force particular candidates on constituencies; but the Parliament of March, 1553, was the only one in the sixteenth century that can fairly be described as nominated by the government; and Renard, when discussing the question of a Parliament in the following August, asked Charles V whether he thought it advisable to have a general Parliament or merely an assembly of "notables" summoned after the manner introduced by Northumberland. A circular appears to have been sent round ordering the electors to return the members nominated by the Council. Even this measure was not considered sufficient to ensure a properly subservient House of Commons; and at the same time eleven new boroughs returning twenty-two members were created, principally in Cornwall, where Crown influence was supreme. The process of packing had already been applied to the Privy Council, more than half of which, as it existed in 1553, had been nominated since Northumberland's accession to power. To this Parliament the Duke represented his financial needs as exclusively due to the maladministration of the Protector, who had been deposed three and a half years before; and a subsidy was granted which was not, however, to be paid for two years. Acts were also passed with a view to checking fiscal abuses; but Northumberland again met with some traces of independence in the Commons, and Parliament was dissolved on March 31, having sat for barely a month.

The ground was fast slipping from under Northumberland's feet, and the Nemesis which had long dogged his steps was drawing perceptibly nearer. Zimri had no peace, and from the time of Somerset's fall never a month passed without some symptom of popular discontent. In October, 1551, a rumour spread that a coinage was being minted at Dudley Castle stamped with Northumberland's badge, the bear and ragged staff, and in 1552 he was widely believed to be aiming at the Crown. Even some of his favourite preachers began to denounce him in thinly veiled terms from the pulpit. No longer a Moses or Joshua, he was not obscurely likened to Ahitophel. His only support was the young King, over whose mind he had established complete dominion; and Edward VI was now slowly dying before his eyes. The consequences to himself of a demise of the Crown were only too clear; his ambition had led him into so many crimes and had made him so many enemies that his life was secure only so long as he controlled the government and prevented the administration of justice. There was no room for repentance; he could expect no mercy when his foes were once in a

position to bring him to book. The accession of Mary would almost inevitably be followed by his own attainder; and the prospect drove him to make one last desperate bid for life and for power.

There were other temptations which led him to stake his all on a single throw. No immediate interference need be feared from abroad. Scotland, now little more than a province of France, had no desire to see a half-Spanish princess on the English throne, and France was even more reluctant to witness the transference of England's resources to the hands of Charles V. The Emperor was fully occupied with the French war, and Mary had nothing on which to rely except the temper of England. Northumberland's endeavour to alter the Succession might well seem worth the making. He could appeal to the fact that no woman had sat on the English throne, and that the only attempt to place one there had been followed by civil war. Margaret Beaufort had been excluded in favour of her son; and in the reign of Henry VIII there were not wanting those who preferred the claim of an illegitimate son to that of a legitimate daughter. He could also play upon the dread of religious reaction and of foreign domination which would ensue if Mary succeeded and, as she probably would, married an alien. The Netherlands, Hungary, and Bohemia had all by marriage been brought under Habsburg rule and with disastrous consequences; might not England be reserved for a similar fate? Some of these objections applied also to the Princess Elizabeth, but not all, and Northumberland would have stood a better chance of success had he selected as his candidate the daughter of Anne Boleyn. But such a solution would not necessarily have meant a continuance of his own supremacy, and that was the vital point.

Hence the Duke had recourse to a plan which was hopelessly illegal, illogical, unpopular, and unconstitutional. Edward VI was induced to settle the Crown on Lady Jane Grey, the grand-daughter of Henry VIII's sister, Mary, Duchess of Suffolk; she was married to Northumberland's fourth son, Guilford Dudley, and Dudley was to receive the Crown matrimonial, and thus mitigate the objections to a female sovereign. The arrangement was illegal, because Edward VI had not been empowered by law, as Henry had, to leave the Crown by will; and any attempt to alter the Succession established by Parliament and by Henry's will was treason. It was illogical, because, even supposing that Henry's will could be set aside and his two daughters excluded as illegitimate, the next claimant was Mary, Queen of Scots, the grand-daughter of Henry's elder sister Margaret. Moreover, if the Suffolk line was adopted, the proper heir was Lady Jane's mother, the wife of Henry Grey, Duke of Suffolk. There was thus little to recommend the King's "device" except the arbitrary will of Northumberland, who in May, 1553, endeavoured to implicate his chief supporters in the plot by a series of dynastic marriages. His daughter Catharine was given to Lord Hastings; Lady Jane's sister Catharine to Pembroke's son, Lord Herbert, and Lady Jane's cousin

Margaret Clifford (another possible claimant) to Northumberland's brother Andrew. The news of these arrangements confirmed the popular suspicions of the Duke's designs, and during the month of June foreign ambassadors in London were kept pretty well informed of the progress of the plot. The reluctant consent of the Council was obtained by a promise that Parliament should be summoned at once to confirm the settlement; and on June 11 the judges were ordered to draw up letters patent embodying the young King's wishes. They resisted at first, but Edward's urgent commands, Northumberland's violence, and a pardon under the Great Seal for their action at length extorted compliance. On the 21st the Council with some open protests and many mental reservations signed the letters patent. The Tower had been secured; troops had been hastily raised; and the fleet had been manned. Every precaution that fear could inspire had been taken when the last male Tudor died on July 6 at Greenwich; nothing remained but for the nation to declare, through such channels as were still left open, its verdict on the claims of Mary and the Duke of Northumberland's rule.

CHAPTER XV.

PHILIP AND MARY.

The contention of religious parties amid which the reign of Mary commenced—the legacy of the preceding reign—still further weakened the royal authority at home, while it materially lowered England in the estimation of the great Powers abroad. The Protector Somerset had failed to accomplish the design to which he had devoted his best energies, that of Union with Scotland, whereby the United Kingdom should assert its position as the leading Protestant State in Europe. The innate cruelty of Northumberland's nature, as seen in the merciless malignity with which he brought his rival to the scaffold, and carried out the reversal of his policy, had caused him to be regarded with aversion by the great majority of his countrymen; while the humiliating circumstances under which peace had been concluded both with France and with Scotland had revealed alike the financial and the moral weakness of the nation. Not only had the rulers of the country themselves ceased to be actuated by a statesmanlike and definite foreign policy, but the leading Powers on the Continent had gradually come to regard England from a different point of view. The revenue of the English Crown was but a fraction of that which Henry II of France or Charles V could raise. And by degrees the country whose King, a generation before, had hurled defiance at Rome and treated on equal terms with Spain and France, had come to be looked upon by these latter Powers as one whose government and people were alike fickle and untrustworthy, and whose policy vacillated and rulers changed so often as to render its alliance a matter scarcely deserving serious diplomatic effort, its annexation far from impracticable. But whether that annexation would have to be effected by diplomacy or by force, by a matrimonial alliance or by actual conquest, was still uncertain. Such, however, was the alternative that chiefly engaged the thoughts of the representatives of the great continental Powers during the reign of Mary.

When we turn to consider the instruments who served their diplomacy in England, it must be admitted that the envoys of both French and Spain were well fitted to represent their respective

sovereigns. The bad faith and cynical inconsistency of Henry II reappeared in the mischievous intrigues and shameless mendacity of Antoine de Noailles. The astute and wary policy of the Emperor was not inadequately reproduced by the energetic and adroit, although sometimes too impetuous, Simon Renard. On the Venetian envoys, Giacomo Soranzo and Giovanni Michiel, it devolved carefully to observe rather than to seek to guide events; and the latter, although designated an imperialist by de Noailles, appears to have preserved a studiously impartial attitude; while the accuracy of his information was such that the French ambassador did not scruple to avail himself of the dishonesty of Michiel's secretary, Antonio Mazza, to purchase clandestinely much of the intelligence transmitted to the Doge of Venice by his envoy.

In the selection of her representatives at the foregoing Courts, Mary, on the other hand, does not appear to have been unduly biassed by personal predilections. Thirlby, Bishop of Norwich, afterwards stood high in her favour; but when, in April, 1553, he was for the second time accredited ambassador to the Emperor, it was under the auspices of Northumberland. Expediency alone can have suggested that Nicholas Wotton and Peter Vannes, both of whom had taken an active part in the proceedings connected with the divorce of Catharine of Aragon, should be retained at their posts,—the one in Paris, the other in Venice. Wotton's loyalty to his new sovereign, his ability and courage, were alike unquestionable; and when, in 1555-7, Mary's throne was threatened by the machinations of the English exiles, it was to his vigilance and dexterity that the English government was mainly indebted for its earliest information of the conspirators' intentions. At Venice, Peter Vannes discharged his duties as ambassador with commendable discretion and assiduity, although, at one critical juncture, he did not escape the reproach of excessive caution. But as a native of Lucca, and one who had been collector of the papal taxes in England, who had filled the post of Latin secretary to Wolsey, King Henry and King Edward in succession, and who had been employed on more than one important diplomatic mission, he offered a combination of qualifications which it would have been difficult to match. Although he was nearly sixty years of age, his energies showed no decline; and Mary herself could suggest no one more fit to be her representative at the Venetian Court.

The 6th of July, the day of Edward's death, had not passed away before the Council were apprised of the event; but it was decided that the fact should be kept strictly secret until the necessary measures had been taken for securing the succession of the Lady Jane Grey. In pursuance of this decision, Clinton (the Lord Admiral), the Marquis of Winchester (the Lord Treasurer) and the Earl of Shrewsbury forthwith placed a strong garrison in the Tower; while the civic authorities were summoned to appear, through their representatives, before the Council at Greenwich. The Lord Mayor, together with "six aldermen,

as many merchants of the staple and as many merchant adventurers, accordingly repaired thither, when the late monarch's decease was mad known to them, and the letters patent, whereby he had devised th Succession to the House of Suffolk, were laid before them. These the were called upon to sign, and also to take an oath of allegiance to Quee Jane. They were, however, charged to divulge nothing, but quietly t take whatever measures they might deem requisite for the preservatio of order in the City, and to procure the acquiescence of the citizens i the succession of their new sovereign; and, at three o'clock in th afternoon of Monday (the 10th), Jane was conveyed by water to th Tower, where she was formally received as Queen. At five o'clocl public proclamation was made both of Edward's death and of the fac that by his decree "the Lady Jane and her heirs male" were to be hi recognised successors. Printed copies of the document which the lat King had executed were at the same time circulated among the peopl in order to make clear the grounds on which the claim of the ne Queen rested.

In the meantime, two days before her brother's death, Mary, apprise of the hopeless nature of his illness, had effected her escape by nigh from Hunsdon to her palace at Kenninghall, an ancient structur formerly belonging to the Dukes of Norfolk, which had been bestowe on her by Henry on the attainder of the actual Duke. The Princess ha formerly been accustomed to hold her Court there; but the building were ill adapted for defence, and on the 11th she quitted Kenningha for Framlingham in Suffolk. Framlingham, another of the seats of th Howards, was situated in the district where Northumberland's ruthle suppression of the rebellion of 1549 was still fresh in the memories c the population; and the strength and position of the castle, surmounte by lofty towers and on the margin of a wide expanse of water, made i an excellent rallying-point for Mary's supporters. Moreover, bein distant but a few miles from the coast, it offered facilities for escape t the Continent, should such a necessity arise. Within less than forty eight hours it had become known to Northumberland in London, tha the Earl of Bath, Sir Thomas Wharton, Sir John Mordaunt, Sir Williar Drury, Sir Henry Bedingfield (formerly the custodian of Mary's mother a Kimbolton), along with other noblemen and gentlemen, some of them a the head of a considerable body of retainers, were gathering at Fram lingham. The Council, on assembling at the Tower on the 12th, ha already decided that it was expedient for the security of the realm, tha Mary should forthwith be brought to London; and Suffolk was, in th first instance, designated for the task of giving effect to their decisior Jane, however, overcome by a sense of responsibility and by nervou apprehension, entreated that her father might be permitted "to tarry a home to keep her company"; and Northumberland was accordingl called upon to proceed on the perilous errand. The terror which hi

name was likely to inspire, and his reputation as "the best manne of war in the realme," might be looked upon as justifying his selection. But on the other hand it was also notorious that throughout the eastern counties his name was held in execration as that of the man who had brought Somerset to the scaffold; and the rumour was already spreading widely that he had, by foul play, precipitated the death of the young King. The wishes of the Council were, however, too strongly urged for him to be able to decline the errand; and the following day was devoted to making ready for the expedition and to the arming of a sufficient retinue. When the Lords of the Council assembled at dinner, Northumberland availed himself of the opportunity to deliver an harangue in which he adverted to the perils awaiting him and his followers, and commended the families of the latter to the care of his audience. He further reminded those who listened, that to "the originall grounde" on which their policy rested—"the preferment of Goddes Word and the feare of papestry's re-entrance"—there was now added the new oath of allegiance, which bound them to support the Queen's cause, and he adjured them to be faithful to their vow.

On Friday, July 14, he set out with his forces through the streets of London; but the absence of all sympathy on the part of the populace either with him or his errand was only too apparent. He himself, as he passed along Shoreditch, was heard to exclaim: "the people press to see us, but not one sayeth 'God speed ye!'" Under the belief that Mary's change of residence to Framlingham was simply designed to facilitate her escape to Flanders, he had some days before given orders that ships carrying picked crews to the number of two thousand men should be stationed off the Norfolk coast to intercept her passage. The spirits of Mary's supporters at this crisis were far from high; nor was Charles at Brussels by any means sanguine in his cousin's cause. His instructions, transmitted on June 23 to his ambassadors extraordinary to the English Court while they were still at Calais, were drawn up in contemplation of the crisis which seemed likely to arise on Edward's death, which was even then regarded as imminent. On their arrival in London they were forthwith to obtain, if possible, an interview with the young King; and precise directions were given with respect to their attitude towards Northumberland and the Council. In the event of Edward's death, Mary's best policy, Charles considered, would be her betrothal to one of her own countrymen;—the machinations of France would thus be effectually counteracted, the mistrust of Northumberland and his party would be disarmed. It would be well also to come as soon as might be to a general understanding with the Council; a result which, the imperial adviser considered, might be attained by Mary's undertaking to introduce no innovations either in the administration of civil affairs or in religion, and at the same time concluding a kind of amnesty with those actually in office,—"patiently waiting until God should vouchsafe

the opportunity of restoring everything by peaceful means." His envoys were also enjoined to give his cousin all possible assistance and advice in connexion with any obligations she might enter into with the Council and any pledges she might give.

Edward's death, followed within a week by that of Maurice of Saxony from a wound received in the battle of Sievershausen, materially modified the aspect of affairs. On the Continent, Charles was now able to concentrate his efforts on the conflict with France; while in England the remarkable change in Mary's prospects constrained both Catholic and Protestant writers to recognise in results so rapidly attained an express intervention of Providence.

The first report transmitted to Charles by his ambassadors after their arrival in London conveyed the tidings of Edward's death, and of Northumberland's occupation of the Tower as champion of the cause of the Lady Jane Grey. It further stated that Mary, after taking counsel with her confidants, had been proclaimed Queen at Framlingham, a course adopted under the belief that large numbers would thus be encouraged openly to declare themselves in her favour. In the opinion of Renard himself, however, she was committing herself to a line of action which, considering the resources at Northumberland's command, the support which he was regularly receiving from France, and the actual complications in continental affairs, must be pronounced hopeless. Charles in his reply (July 11, 1553) advised his envoys to content themselves for the present with watching the situation; but he suggested that, if Northumberland persisted in his opposition to Mary's claims, it might be well to endeavour to persuade those English peers who favoured the Catholic cause to make such a demonstration as might serve to render the Duke more amenable to reason. Renard's misgivings were, however, soon modified by further and more accurate intelligence; and in a letter to Prince Philip he was able to report that Paget had resumed his seat in the Council, in whose policy a complete change had taken place. Then came news that on July 19, while the rebel leaders were marching from Cambridge to attack the castle at Framlingham, Mary had been proclaimed on Tower Hill by Suffolk himself, and again at Paul's Cross, and that he had at the same time given orders that the insignia of royalty should be removed from his daughter's chambers. The diarist at his post in the Tower and the imperial ambassadors in the City concur in describing the demonstrations which followed as characterised by remarkable enthusiasm,—the bonfires and roaring cannon, the pealing bells and sonorous long-disused organs, the profuse largesses,—all offering a marked contrast to the apathy and silence with which the proclamation of Jane had been received. The Council now sent off official information of the event to Mary, who was at the same time advised not to disarm her forces until Northumberland's submission or defeat was beyond doubt. Three days later Renard was able to report that the

proclamation had everywhere been so favourably received that Mary might now be regarded as secure in her position "as true and hereditary Queen of England, without difficulty, doubt, or impediment."

While events were progressing thus rapidly in London Northumberland, accompanied by the Marquis of Northampton and Lord Grey, had arrived on the evening of Saturday, July 15, at Cambridge. Here he rested for the Sunday, and as both Lord High Steward and Chancellor of the University was hospitably entertained by the academic authorities. On the Monday he set out for Bury St Edmunds, expecting to be joined at Newmarket by the reinforcements from the capital. These however failed to appear, while defections from his own ranks became numerous; and he now learned that the crews of the ships sent to intercept Mary's passage, had, on arriving at Yarmouth, declared for her, and their captains had followed their example. On the 18th, accordingly, Northumberland set out on his return from Bury to Cambridge, where at five o'clock on the evening of the 20th, the news having arrived that Mary had been proclaimed in London, he himself also proclaimed her in the market-place; and, as the tears ran down his face, ejaculated that he knew her to be a merciful woman. An hour later he received an order from the Council. It was signed by Cranmer, Goodrich (Bishop of Ely and Lord Chancellor), the Marquis of Winchester, the Duke of Suffolk, and the Earls of Pembroke, Bedford, and Shrewsbury, and directed him forthwith to disarm and disband his army, but not himself to return to London until the royal pleasure was known. If he would thus "shew himselfe like a good quiet subject," the missive went on to say, "wee will then continue as we have begun, as humble suters to our Soueraigne Lady the Queenes Highnesse, for him and his and for our selves."

The Cambridge authorities now hastened to send congratulatory letters to Framlingham; while Gardiner, the former Chancellor of the University, was re-elected to that office. In the letter announcing his re-election he was urged to restore to the Schools their former freedom and "to annul the lawless laws which held their consciences in bondage." The Constable de Montmorency, writing (July 24) to Lord Howard, the governor of Calais, promised that he would himself conduct all the forces at his disposal to protect that town, should the Emperor, taking advantage of the crisis, seek to occupy it. But five days later Noailles was able to report to the Duke of Orleans that troops, cavalry and foot-soldiers, had rallied to Mary's support to the number of between 35,000 and 40,000 men—all inspired with unprecedented enthusiasm and asking for no pay, but voluntarily contributing money, plate, and rings from their own slender resources. At Framlingham there were now to be seen, besides Mary's avowed supporters, numerous nobles and gentlemen, confessing their disloyalty and asking for pardon. In most cases these petitions received a favourable response. Cecil, who could plead that he had signed the Instrument of Succession under compulsion, was restored

to favour although not to office. But the Dudleys, both Robert and Ambrose, and about a hundred other leading commoners, among whom was Sir Thomas Wyatt, remained for a time under arrest. On July 27 the two Lord Chief Justices, Sir Roger Cholmeley and Sir Edward Montagu, were committed to the Tower, where, on the following day, they were joined by the Duke of Suffolk and Sir John Cheke, and, before the end of the month, by Northumberland and his Duchess, with their eldest son (the Earl of Warwick), Guilford Dudley, and the Lady Jane.

On July 29 Henry at Compiègne signed the credentials of the Sieur Antoine de Noailles as ambassador to Mary; and two days later it was intimated to Nicholas Wotton, Pickering, and Chaloner that the Queen desired to retain them in their posts as her representatives at the French Court. Early in August, Cardinal Pole, in his monastic retirement at Maguzzano on the Lago di Garda, received from Julius III his appointment as papal Legate to England, with instructions to visit both the Imperial and the French Court on his journey thither.

For the present Mary determined to be guided mainly by the advice of her cousin the Emperor, a decision the wisdom of which was clearly attested by subsequent events as well as by the letters, numerous and lengthy, which Charles addressed to his envoys at her Court in connexion with each important question as it arose. From the first he advised that the Queen should scrupulously avoid appearing to set herself in opposition to the prejudices and feelings of her people, and should above all things endeavour to appear "*une bonne Anglaise.*" It was from France alone, he considered, that she had reason to apprehend much danger; although Scotland, as subservient to French policy, also required to be carefully watched. The French envoys had just presented their credentials to Courtenay, and, as a well-known sympathiser with the Italian Reformers, he was regarded by the Emperor with especial mistrust. It was rumoured that the young nobleman was making advances to Elizabeth. Such an alliance, Charles pointed out, was fraught with danger and must, if possible, be prevented. The Princess' attitude in relation to the new doctrines also required to be carefully observed. As for the rebels, let exemplary punishment be inflicted on the leaders, and the rest be treated with clemency. The Lady Jane doubtless deserved death, but it might be well for the present simply to keep her in close custody, where she would be unable to hold communication with traitors. Finally, Mary was advised to get the finances in good order, so as to have funds ready for any emergency, and, more especially, to exercise a vigilant control over the expenditure of the secret service money.

Counsel of a very different nature came from Italy, where Cardinal Pole's fervid enthusiasm as a would-be reformer of religious discipline in England was prudently held in check alike by Emperor and Pope. His letters at this period, while conceived in a spirit of

unselfish devotion to the interests of Catholicism, attest the unpractical character of the writer and the influences of the monastic seclusion in which he had lately sought refuge. Early in August, Gian Francesco Commendone, the papal chamberlain, and Penning, one of Pole's confidants, were sent expressly, the one from Brussels, the other from Rome, in order more accurately to gauge both the royal intentions and popular feeling. It was only after considerable delay that they succeeded in gaining admission to Mary's presence, when her own language held out so little hope of her being able at once to adopt a decisive policy that Commendone forthwith set out on his return journey. Penning, however, remained until the Coronation, and was then sent back to Pole with a letter from the Queen. In a letter to the Queen, dated August 13, the Cardinal had already enunciated his views of Mary's position and responsibilities. Heresy was the source of all evil; unbridled passion had led her father first to divorce himself from his wedded wife, and next to separate from his mother the Church and to disobey her spiritual Head. Mary had already reaped a reward for her loyalty to the true faith in her astonishing triumph over her rebel subjects. If ever the interposition of Divine Providence in human affairs had been clearly apparent, it was in the recent crisis in England. He hopes that the character of her rule will make manifest her consciousness of this fact, and he is especially anxious to be informed as to her real sentiments. When once admitted to her presence, he relies on being able to convince her that her crown and the welfare of the nation alike depend on obedience to the Church. In her reply, Mary expressed her heartfelt grief at being, as yet, unable to disclose her secret wishes, but intimated that, as soon as it was in her power, she hoped to carry them into effective execution. Pole, however, could see no advantage in delay, holding that it was especially desirable that he should himself be near at hand "to assist the Queen's good intentions"; demurring at the same time to the proposal that the Pope should forthwith "exempt England from every interdict and censure," on the ground that so momentous a decision would more fitly be considered by himself on his arrival.

All that Julius III and the Emperor could do was to contrive that a counsellor of so much distinction and of so small discretion should be kept back as long as possible from the arena where his influence was likely to prove most disastrous. By the Pontiff, Pole was designated *legatus pro pace* and instructed to visit on his journey to England both the Imperial and the French Court, with the view of bringing about, if possible, an understanding between Charles and Henry. By the Emperor, the audience which the Cardinal asked for at Brussels was deferred, under various pretexts, until January, 1554. As early however as October 2, Pole had arrived at Trent, where we find him writing to Courtenay and extolling the negative virtues which had adorned his captivity

in the Tower, little surmising on what a career his cousin had already embarked, to the ruin alike of his health and his fortunes.

During these critical days Elizabeth had remained in seclusion at Hatfield, preserving an attitude of studied neutrality. But on July 29 she entered London with a large train of followers and took up her residence at Somerset House. Five days later, the Queen made her triumphal entry into the City in the evening, and was joined at Aldgate by her sister, the two riding side by side through the streets amid the acclamations of the populace. Mary, following the usual practice of royalty prior to coronation, now proceeded to occupy the State apartments in the Tower. At the Great Gate, the Duke of Norfolk, Bishop Gardiner, the Duchess of Somerset, and the youthful Courtenay awaited her arrival, all in a kneeling posture, and were by her command formally restored to liberty. Jane, on the other hand, found herself a prisoner, and was consigned to the custody of the new governor, Sir John Brydges. Gardiner was sworn a member of the Privy Council, and, on August 23, appointed Lord High Chancellor On the 8th of the same month the funeral service for the late King was held in Westminster Abbey, being conducted by Cranmer and according to the Protestant ritual. Mary, however, commanded that a requiem mass should also be celebrated in the Tower, which she strongly pressed Elizabeth to attend. The Princess did not comply, but by her regular attendance at Court gave evidence of her desire to conciliate her sister as far as possible, and six weeks later was to be seen hearing mass in her company. Her compliance, however, as Noailles himself admits, was generally regarded as dictated by fear rather than principle.

It soon however became evident that the recognition of the Legate and the contemplated resumption of relations with the Roman See were measures which would be attended with far greater difficulties than the restoration of the ancient worship. Even Gardiner, whose general sympathy with such designs there can be no reason for doubting, felt himself bound, like the Emperor, to counsel the greatest caution and deliberation. The nobles and country gentry, enriched by those monastic and Church lands which they would be called upon to restore, the Bishops whose deposition was regarded as imminent, alike represented vested interests which could hardly be assailed without danger. In a proclamation issued August 18, Mary announced, accordingly, her intention of deferring various questions of policy until Parliament, summoned to assemble on October 5, could be consulted. But in the meantime certain measures which did not appear to admit of being thus postponed were carried into effect. Of some sixty rebels denounced as traitors seven were convicted of high treason; but of these three only —Northumberland, Sir John Gates, and Sir Thomas Palmer—actually suffered the extreme penalty. Gardiner himself is said to have interceded on behalf of the Duke, who, buoyed up by the hope that the

royal clemency would be extended to him on the scaffold itself, there acknowledged the justice of his sentence and made a complete renunciation of Protestantism, even going so far as to attribute the intestine strife and the miseries, which for so many years had troubled alike England and Germany, to the defection of those realms from the true faith. The Roman ritual was not as yet formally restored as obligatory on all loyal subjects, but in her private chapel Mary heard mass. The Protestant Bishops were deposed; and an injunction was issued that none of the clergy should preach without the royal licence, while any member of that body was to be liable to suspension if his conduct proved unsatisfactory. Gardiner, Bonner, Heath, and Day were reinstated in their respective sees of Winchester, London, Worcester, and Chichester. The see of Durham, which Northumberland had suppressed, appropriating its ample revenues to his own use, was restored, and Cuthbert Tunstall installed as Bishop. On August 29 Gardiner received instructions himself to select and appoint capable preachers who were to be sent to discharge their functions throughout the country.

Not a few of the more eminent preachers among the Reformers, foreseeing the storm, had already fled to the Continent; but a certain number still remained, such as Latimer and John Bradford, openly to call in question the prerogatives which the Queen still arrogated to herself as Head of the Church. Foremost, however, among those who refused to flee was Archbishop Cranmer, who at his palace in Lambeth confronted the reactionary tendencies around him with an intrepidity which marked him out for general observation. Already obnoxious, owing to his complicity in the diversion of the Succession to the Crown, he was by his open denunciation of the restoration of the Mass, which he declared to involve "many horrible blasphemies," exposed to the charge of open resistance to the royal authority. On September 8 he was summoned before the Council to answer for the publication of the Declaration in which he had given expression to his views. His defence, if such it could be termed, was rightly regarded as evasive. He pleaded that Scory, the deprived Bishop of Chichester, had published the Declaration without his formal authorisation, though he admitted that it had been his intention to give it. He was accordingly committed to the Tower (September 14), where Ridley, who had publicly proclaimed the illegitimacy of both Mary and Elizabeth, had already been a prisoner for two months. Latimer's committal had taken place a day before Cranmer's, who, early in October, was followed by his brother Primate, Archbishop Holgate. The latter was now more than seventy years of age, and chiefly obnoxious on account of the persistent energy with which he assailed all that reflected the Roman ritual and ornamentation in the churches.

On October 1 Mary was crowned in Westminster Abbey—the procession from the Tower and the entire ceremonial being marked by

much splendour and by a revival of all the features and details which belonged to such ceremonies in medieval times. The whole Court also now resumed the brilliant attire and costly adornments of the reign of Henry VIII. On the 5th of the month Mary's first Parliament assembled. The Council, out of deference to the royal wishes, had contemplated measures which would have reversed all the anti-papal enactments of both the preceding reigns. But here the Commons assumed a decisive attitude: and it was eventually determined that the question of restoring the lands and other property, which had been wrested from the Church and the suppressed monasteries, should not be considered, and that, with respect to the supremacy in matters of religion, legislation should go back no further than to the commencement of Edward's reign. Whatever appeared to favour papal authority was, as Mary in a letter to Pole herself admitted, regarded with suspicion. On the other hand, much was done to propitiate the new sovereign. A bill was at once brought in legalising the marriage of Catharine of Aragon and abolishing all disabilities attaching to the profession of the old faith. The opposition of the Protestant party in the House caused a certain delay; but after an interval of three days the ministers brought in two bills the one affirming the legality of Catharine's marriage without adverting to the papal decision; the other rescinding the legislation affecting religious worship and the Church during the reign of the late King. The retrospective force of the latter bill went, however, no further—the ecclesiastical supremacy of the Crown being still tacitly admitted. But, on the other hand, it involved the renunciation of the chief results of Cranmer's efforts during the preceding reign—the Reformed Liturgy, the First and Second Books of Common Prayer, the administration of the Sacrament in both kinds, and the recognition of a married clergy—and was consequently not allowed to pass without considerable opposition. But its opponents, although representing nearly a third of the Lower House, did not deem it prudent to press the question to a division, and in the Upper House no resistance was offered.

It was manifest that conclusions so incompatible—the recognition of Mary as Head of the Church in England and the tacit assumption of the Papal Supremacy—represented a temporising policy which was not likely to secure the permanent support of either party. Cardinal Pole declared himself profoundly dissatisfied: the Divine favour had recently been conspicuously shown in that outburst of loyal feeling which had secured Mary's succession, and sovereign and people alike were bound by gratitude forthwith to seek reconciliation with the Holy See and to afford its Legate an honourable reception. The Emperor and Gardiner, on the other hand, still counselled caution, and more especially patience in awaiting the results of a gradual re-establishment of that Roman ritual which early association and religious sentiment endeared to the hearts of a majority of the population. In common with many of her

subjects, the Queen herself firmly believed that nothing would more effectually contribute to the desired end than the prospect of a Catholic heir to the throne; and, although in her thirty-seventh year and in infirm health, she consequently regarded her own marriage as a duty to the State. But even if personal predilection was to be sacrificed on the altar of duty, her choice of a husband was a matter involving anxious consideration amid the conflicting claims of the national welfare and of the Catholic faith. In its broadest phase, the question lay between a native of her own country and a foreigner. The nation undoubtedly wished to see her married to one of her own nobles; it is equally certain that Mary's devout attachment to the interests of the Roman Church inclined her to look abroad. In the course of the year following upon her accession report singled out three supposed claimants for her hand, of whom one was sixteen years her senior, the other two each about ten years her junior.

There is no evidence that Reginald Pole ever aspired to marry Mary, or that she, in turn, ever regarded him in any other light than that of a much valued friend and counsellor. The personal graces and touching experiences of Edward Courtenay might well recommend him to a woman's sympathies. He was the son of Edward Courtenay, Marquis of Exeter, who had been executed in 1539 for his share in the conspiracy in favour of Reginald Pole, and was thus the great-grandson of Edward IV. Mary herself had just freed him from an imprisonment of nearly fifteen years and had created him Earl of Devonshire, while at her coronation he was selected to bear the sword before her. His mother, the Marchioness of Exeter, one of Mary's dearest friends, was now one of her ladies in waiting. His long isolation from society and neglected education had however ill qualified him to play a part in politics, while the fascinations which surrounded him in his newly acquired freedom proved too potent for his self-control, and his wild debaucheries became the scandal of the capital. Whatever influence Pole might have been able to exert would probably have favoured Courtenay's claims. As a boy, both he and his brother Geoffrey had received much kindness from the Marquis of Exeter, the young Earl's father—favours which Geoffrey had ill repaid by bearing evidence which brought the Marquis to the scaffold—and Pole's own mother, the Countess of Salisbury, prior to her tragic execution, had shared the captivity of the Marchioness. But Courtenay's indiscretions soon rendered the efforts of his best friends nugatory. It now became known that his conduct had completely lost him Mary's favour, and he was next heard of as conspiring against his would-be benefactress.

To a fairly impartial observer it might well have seemed that the arguments for and against the Spanish marriage were of nearly equal force. Certain political advantages were obvious, and as Renard pointed out to the Queen herself it would afford the necessary counterbalance

to the matrimonial alliance which already existed between France and Scotland; while the national antipathy to Spaniards, having its origin in commercial rivalry, could hardly be supposed to extend to a great prince like Philip. On the other hand, it would be necessary to obtain the papal dispensation; for Mary and Philip were within the degrees of consanguinity forbidden by the Canon Law. There also appeared to be considerable danger as regarded the Succession; for if Mary died without issue, as seemed highly probable, it was difficult to foresee what claims her husband might not advance Such were the circumstances in which Gardiner, who had formed a regard for Courtenay when they were prisoners together, had, in the first instance, suggested that the Queen should marry the young English noble, and that Elizabeth should be excluded from the Succession; while Paget, who had just received back his Garter, thought it best that Mary's choice should be left free, but that she should recognise Elizabeth as her presumptive successor. The great majority of the nobles and gentry, whether Catholic or Protestant, were divided and perplexed by the opposing considerations of the danger of a foreign yoke, the hope of seeing an hereditary faith restored, and the necessity which might yet ensue of being called upon to surrender those former possessions of the Church which constituted, in many cases, the present holder's chief wealth.

A selection which would draw closer the ties between England and Spain was naturally regarded with jealousy by the French monarch, and Noailles was instructed to use every effort to avert it. He accordingly plied his arguments and persuasions with untiring assiduity in every direction, and so far succeeded that the Commons were prevailed upon to vote an Address to the Crown, in which, while urging upon Mary the desirability of marriage, they also advised that her choice should be restricted to the peerage of her own realm. A week later Renard had an audience of the Queen, at which he made the offer from Charles himself of Philip's hand. Mary had previously made careful enquiry of the ambassador himself respecting the Prince's habits and natural disposition, and, after a short time had been allowed to elapse for apparent deliberation, intimated her acceptance of the offer.

Such were the circumstances in which, on November 17, the Commons presented the above-mentioned Address. The customary mode of procedure required that Gardiner, as Chancellor, should be the royal mouthpiece in reply. But Mary, rising from her throne, herself gave answer, and did so, if we may credit Renard, in terms of some asperity, repudiating the right of the Commons to control her decision, and declaring that Elizabeth, who was illegitimate, should never be her successor. Early in December it was rumoured that Courtenay was making advances to Elizabeth, and that Noailles was playing the part of go-between. Elizabeth, accordingly, deemed it prudent to request her sister's permission to retire to her seat at Ashridge in Hertfordshire;

nd her application was granted by Mary with every demonstration of ordial affection.

The triumph of the imperialist party seemed complete; and Noailles vas fain to report to Henry that Mary seemed more Spanish than English n her sympathies. The Chancellor himself, now that Courtenay's chances ppeared to be at an end, came forward as a supporter of the match with pain, and proceeded to take a foremost part in the negotiations with espect to the various questions, direct and collateral, which such an lliance involved—the marriage treaty itself, the provisions in case of ssue, and those in case of failure. On January 2, 1554, Count Egmont nd other plenipotentiaries appeared in London, duly empowered to make he final arrangements. Courtenay himself gave them official welcome at 'ower Hill, and conducted them to Westminster. On the 14th Gardiner ead aloud in the presence chamber the articles which had been agreed pon and pointed out the political advantages which would result from uch an alliance. The articles, originally extending over thirteen pages, ad been expanded to twenty-two, and represented the labours of ten ommissioners—those cooperating with Renard, the Counts Egmont and alaing, de Courrières, and Philip Nigri; those appointed by the Queen, Gardiner, Arundel, Paget, Sir Robert Rochester, and Petre. As finally greed upon, the treaty must be held highly creditable to Gardiner's agacity and ability; and when, eighteen years afterwards, the marriage f Elizabeth with the Duke of Anjou was in contemplation, it served as he model for that which was then to be drawn up. It has however een pointed out as a somewhat suspicious feature that the concessions vere all on the imperial side. If, indeed, treaties could bind, Philip tood hand-tied in his relations to England. While nominally sharing he government with the Queen, he was pledged scrupulously to respect he laws, privileges, and customs of the realm; he was to settle on her a ointure of £60,000; their offspring were to succeed them in England in onformity with the traditional rights, and might also succeed to the erritories in Burgundy and Flanders; and, in the event of Philip's son, Don Carlos, dying without issue, this right of succession was to extend o Spain, Milan, and the Two Sicilies. Should Mary's marriage be nfruitful, Philip's connexion with England was to cease at her death. Under no pretext was England to be made participant in the war etween the Emperor and France.

In the meantime Cardinal Pole's arrival in Brussels had been retarded y a long and involuntary stay at the university town of Dillingen, the esidence of the Bishop of Augsburg; while his endeavours to carry on is correspondence with Mary had been frustrated, their messengers aving been stopped on each side of the Channel. It was with difficulty hat she had conveyed to him the simple intimation that, as matters hen stood, his appearance in England as the legate of the Holy See night prove disastrous to the cause which they both had nearest at

heart. But at length, making his way with nervous haste through the plague-smitten towns of Germany, he was able, through the good offices of Fray de Soto, who held a chair of divinity at Dillingen, to present himself at the imperial Court, where he arrived in January, 1554; and Mary's marriage with Philip being by this time virtually decided, his reception was both cordial and splendid. The assurances which he received from Charles and his ministers were indeed so flattering, that he even ventured to hope that his mission as a peace-maker might yet be crowned with success. But, long before the Cardinal could present himself at the French Court, a fresh crisis had supervened in England.

Here the belief was fast gaining ground that the realm was destined to become a dependency of Spain; while in France it was no less firmly believed that Philip's marriage would be made the opportunity for the subjugation of Scotland. Henry, placing no reliance on Mary's pacific assurances, deemed it advisable to send troops into that country, while Wotton, convinced that war was imminent, petitioned to be recalled. That Elizabeth should marry Courtenay and supplant her sister on the throne, now seemed to be the issue most favourable to French interests; and while Henry's ambassadors at the English Court did their best to foment the growing suspicion of Spain, the monarch himself strove to spread the rumour of a fresh rising in England. Writing to his envoy in Venice, he gave him the earliest intelligence of a rising in Kent; and on February 18 Peter Vannes, writing to Mary, enclosed a copy of Henry's letter: according to the intelligence he had received from Noailles, Henry added, it was almost certain that all England would imitate the example thus set and "prefer to die in battle rather than become subject to a foreign Prince." As early as Christmas, the conspirators, assembling in London, had concerted a general rising, which, however, was not to take place until March 18.

Their plans, however, had been suspected; and Gardiner, having wrung from the weak and faithless Courtenay a full confession of the plot, had taken prompt measures for its repression. The ringleaders, who were thus anticipated in their designs nearly two months before the time agreed upon for carrying them into execution, flew recklessly to arms. Suffolk and Sir James Croft, each seeking to raise his tenantry—the one in Warwickshire, the other in Wales—were both arrested and consigned to the Tower before the second week in February had passed. In Devonshire, towards the close of January, local feeling appears to have led a certain number of the gentry to make a demonstration in Courtenay's favour, Sir Peter Carew, who had been sheriff of the county, being foremost among them. His family, however, were unpopular and commanded but little influence, and the other leaders, after vainly awaiting Courtenay's promised appearance at Exeter, suddenly dispersed in panic. Carew fled to Paris and thence to Venice, where his adventurous and turbulent career was nearly brought

to a conclusion by bravos whom Peter Vannes was accused of having hired to assassinate him.

The chief danger arose in Kent, where Sir Thomas Wyatt, a bold and skilful leader, succeeded in collecting a considerable force at Rochester, which was shortly after augmented by 2000 men who had deserted from the standard of Lord Abergavenny near Wrotham Heath. This gathering was the response to a proclamation which he had previously (January 25) issued at Maidstone, in which Mary's supporters were denounced as aiming at the perpetual servitude of her most loving subjects. Englishmen were adjured to rise in defence of liberty and the commonwealth, while intimation was given that aid was on its way from France. With Noailles Wyatt appears actually to have been in correspondence. The Council were divided as to the course which should be pursued and distracted by mutual recriminations; while they also evinced no alacrity in taking measures for the raising of troops. Mary, whom Renard dissuaded from quitting the capital, exhibited on the other hand a courage and resolution which roused the loyal feeling of all around her. While part of the City Guard at once set out to meet the insurgents, the Corporation proceeded to arm an additional force of 500 men to follow in their track. As they approached Rochester Bridge, the Duke of Norfolk, by whom they were commanded, sent forward a herald to proclaim that "all such as wolde desyst their purpose shuld have frank and free pardon." On February 1 the Queen herself appeared at a gathering of the citizens in the Guildhall and delivered a speech which excited general enthusiasm. Wyatt, she said, had demanded to be entrusted with the care of her person, the keeping of the Tower, and the placing of her counsellors; she was convinced that her loyal subjects would never consent that such confidence should be placed in so vile a traitor. As for her marriage, the conspirators were simply making it "a Spanish cloak to cover their pretended purpose against our religion." The Council had pronounced her marriage expedient "both for the wealth of the realm and also of you, our subjects"; should the nobility and the Commons deem it otherwise, she was willing "to abstain from marriage while she lived." Her courage and outspokenness produced a considerable effect; for two days later Noailles sent word that the populace, who had been reported to be meditating an attack on the palace and the consignment of Mary herself into Wyatt's hands, were actively occupied with putting the City into a state of defence and had mustered to the number of 25,000 armed men. To whoever should succeed in making Wyatt a prisoner and bringing him before the Council, a reward of an annuity of one hundred pounds was held out, payable in perpetuity to himself and his descendants.

At this juncture Wyatt appeared in Southwark, but his army amounted only to some 7000 men; no force had arrived from France, while the royal army was daily receiving reinforcements. The

contemporary chronicler has described in graphic narrative the incidents of the final episode:—Wyatt's arrival at Hyde Park Corner; the fierce fighting that ensued as he pressed on to the City; the flight of the cowardly Courtenay; Lord Howard's resolute refusal to open Lud Gate; Wyatt's consequent retreat in the direction of Charing Cross, and surrender at Temple Bar. The number of those slain in the fighting was about forty; fifty of the conspirators were afterwards hanged, the rest were allowed to betake themselves to their homes.

Mary's former clemency had been censured by Charles; and the Queen herself, justifiably incensed at the manner in which that clemency had been requited, was determined not to err again in the same direction. Gardiner, preaching in her presence on February 11, exhorted her now to have mercy on the commonwealth, "the conservation of which required that hurtful members should be cut off." On the following day the tragedy of the execution of the Lady Jane and Lord Guilford Dudley took place on Tower Hill. Of Suffolk's duplicity and entire want of good faith there could be no doubt, while his known sympathy with the Continental Reformers filled up the measure of his offence; and his execution followed about a week later. Wyatt and Suffolk's wealthy and ambitious brother, Lord Thomas Grey, suffered the same fate in the following April. On the same day that the executions commenced Courtenay again found himself a prisoner in the Tower, here he was confronted with Wyatt, who directly accused him of complicity in the rebellion, and for a time his fate seemed doubtful. A few weeks later, however, he was removed to Fotheringay, and a year after he was released on parole, on condition that he quitted the kingdom, when he selected Padua as the place of his retirement. The last of the rebels to suffer was William Thomas, Clerk of the Council under Edward VI, whose execution took place on May 18. According to the statement of Wyatt in his confession before the Commission, Thomas had been the first to suggest the assassination of Mary. In the Tower he attempted suicide; and no detail of ignominy was omitted at his execution.

From each victim an endeavour was made to extort evidence which might assist the authorities in tracing the conspiracy to its suspected origin, and the investigations were consequently lengthened. Charles, although he still counselled caution and deliberation in dealing with matters of religion, urged promptitude in the punishment of the conspirators, so that Mary, "while taking such measures as seemed requisite for her own security in regard to Elizabeth and Courtenay," might the sooner be able to exercise clemency towards those whom she designed to spare, and thus reassure the great majority. The Emperor, indeed, found her procrastination so inexplicable that he was inclined to attribute it to a desire on the part of Gardiner to protect Courtenay. At the commencement of the outbreak Mary had summoned Elizabeth back to Court, where a closer surveillance could be maintained over her

movements. The Princess deferred compliance under the plea of illness; but on February 22 she arrived in a litter at St. James'. Here she remained, a virtual prisoner, until March 18, when the order was given for her removal to the Tower. Thence, on May 18, she was removed to Woodstock, where she continued to reside until the following April, under the custody of Sir Henry Bedingfield, closely watched and deprived of writing materials, but allowed to have service performed according to the English ritual. After the conspiracy had been crushed Charles strongly urged that the Princess should be executed, on the ground of her connivance at Wyatt's plans. Wyatt himself, indeed, in his last words on the scaffold, completely and emphatically exonerated her. It was asserted, however, that there was documentary evidence of her guilt, but that it was destroyed by Gardiner, to whose exertions she was, at this crisis, probably indebted for her life.

The gain to the imperial power which would accrue from the marriage between Mary and Philip had been regarded by Venice with an apprehension scarcely less than that of France; and it was an ascertained fact that a Venetian carrack, anchored at the mouth of the Thames, had supplied Wyatt with arms and a cannon. Suspicion fell upon Soranzo; but on being interrogated before the Council he stoutly denied all knowledge of the transaction, although complaints against him continued to be urged, and the charge itself was formally preferred by Vargas in Venice. On March 27, accordingly, Soranzo's letters of recall were drawn up, and Giovanni Michiel was appointed his successor. On May 22 the latter arrived in England. It probably attests his impartiality in the discharge of his functions that, both by Renard and Noailles, he was subsequently reproached as favouring the opposite party. He appears in reality to have conducted himself throughout with discretion and probity; and, while gaining the esteem of the most discerning judges with whom he came in contact in England, he continued to command the undiminished confidence of the Venetian Council.

In March, Pole had arrived at St Denis, and shortly after had an audience of the King, by whom he was received with marked cordiality. The question of Mary's marriage was naturally one on which the expression of his views was invited; and he was unable to conceal his personal conviction that, Courtenay's political career having now terminated, it would be better that the Queen of England should remain unmarried. In any case, he admitted that her marriage with Philip appeared to him undesirable. That such was his opinion soon became known at the imperial Court; and, on his return to Brussels in April, he not only received a sharp rebuke from the Emperor, but shortly after learned that Charles had urged in Rome the desirability of his recall. He continued, however, to reside in the monastery of Diligam, near Brussels; for Pope Julius could not but feel that his presence as Legate in England would soon be indispensable. But for the present the fact that his attainder

by Parliament was still unreversed, and the evident expediency of reassuring those who now held the alienated Church lands as to his intentions with regard to their restitution, sufficed to justify a slight further delay.

In the meantime, the reaction which ensued after the insurrection had been suppressed had enabled Mary to make known her policy, and to carry it into effect with less reserve. In March, Egmont returned from Brussels, and in his presence and that of the Earl of Pembroke the Queen formally betrothed herself to Philip. Every effort was now made to diffuse throughout the country the belief that the marriage would prove conducive to the stability of the realm and to the increase of its prestige. Wotton, writing to Noailles from Paris, pointed out, at some length, that the involved alliance with Spain was England's indispensable rejoinder to the danger which menaced her through the conjunction of France with Scotland; while he further maintained that it was as a means of defence against this ominous combination that Charles desired to bring about a union between England and Flanders, between the House of Tudor and that of Habsburg; as for the intention with which France credited him,—the subjugation of the country and the disarming of its population,—such designs had no place in the imperial breast. In support of these views he adduced the fact that large numbers of the English malcontents were daily arriving in France, seeking service under Henry, "in order to carry on the war against the Emperor by sea."

The assembling of Mary's second Parliament (April 2, 1554) at Westminster also served, from the contrast it presented to its predecessor, to emphasise a new departure in public affairs. Not more than seventy of the members of the former House reappeared in the new; and the entire body evinced a spirit of far more ready compliance with the royal wishes. The leading members accepted gratefully the pensions which Mary, aided by the imperial liberality, was able to offer them; and the marriage bill, as it came down from the Upper House, received a ready assent. The necessity for discussion, indeed, was diminished by the fact that the conditions already agreed upon between Charles and Gardiner were now restated with explanatory clauses to obviate misinterpretation. It was also expressly stipulated that the royal match should not in any way "derogate from the league recently concluded between the Queen and the King of France, but that the peace between the English and the French should remain firm and inviolate." Some opposition was offered, however, to the proposal to repeal the two Acts for the dissolution of the bishopric of Durham, the measure being carried by a majority of only 81 in a House of 321.

Her main objects thus attained, Mary dismissed Parliament on May 5; and for the next two months her energies and attention were mainly concentrated on the preparations for the reception of Philip, who arrived from Corunna in Southampton Water on July 20. He was escorted

on the voyage by 150 vessels, carrying a splendid retinue and treasure in bullion amounting to half-a-million of English money. The marriage ceremony, performed by Gardiner, took place in the Cathedral Church of his own diocese of Winchester. At the conclusion, proclamation was made of the future style of Philip and his bride,—"King and Queen of England, France, Naples, Jerusalem, and Ireland, Defenders of the Faith, Princes of Spain and Castile, Archdukes of Austria, Dukes of Milan, Burgundy, and Brabant, Counts of Habsburg, Flanders, and Tyrol." Their public entry into London took place towards the close of August; and the capital now became thronged with Spaniards, among whom priests and friars formed a considerable element. The regularity with which Philip attended mass and observed the other offices of his Church was necessarily construed into evidence of his designs for the restoration of the Roman worship; nor can it be doubted that both to him and Mary this appeared as the paramount object commanding their attention.

Among the royal advisers Gardiner and Paget, by virtue of both experience and ability, assumed the foremost place. Neither, however, could be said to be recommended by consistency of principle in his past career; they had, at more than one juncture, been rivals and even bitter enemies, and they still differed widely in their policy and aims. While Gardiner, who aspired to a dictatorship in the Council, insisted on immediate and coercive measures against heresy, Paget, although admitting that the re-establishment of the ancient faith was essential to a satisfactory adjustment of the affairs of the realm, demurred to what he termed methods of "fire and blood." In their perplexity the two sovereigns appear alike to have come to the conclusion that it might be well to take counsel with advisers who, by their remoteness from the theatre of recent events, might be better able to take a dispassionate view. Foremost among these stood Reginald Pole, who, as Legate, had already, in the preceding April, at Mary's request, nominated six more Bishops to fill the vacant sees,—White, to Lincoln; Bourne, to Bath; Morgan, to St David's; Brooks, to Gloucester; Cotes, to Chester; Griffith, to Rochester. In a highly characteristic letter the Legate himself now appealed to King Philip to admit him, as the Vicar of Christ, "at that door at which he had so long knocked in vain." A precedent afforded by the records of Gardiner's own see of Winchester was at the same time opportunely brought forward as a solution of the difficulty caused by Pole's still unreversed attainder. In the fifteenth century, when the proctor of the English Crown appealed against the exercise of the legatine functions with which Martin V had invested Cardinal Beaufort, at that time also Bishop of Winchester, it had been suggested that Beaufort might act *tanquam cardinalis* although not *tanquam legatus*. It was now ruled that Pole might be admitted into the realm as a Cardinal Ambassador although not as Legate;

while the apprehensions which this decision might have aroused were to a great extent dissipated when it was known that he had obtained from the Pontiff powers whereby he would be able to grant to all holders of monastic and collegiate lands the right of continuing in possession.

On November 20 Pole landed at Dover, and proceeded thence by Canterbury and Rochester to Gravesend. Here he was presented with two documents which finally cleared away all impediments from his path: the first, an Act of Parliament, passed ten days before, reversing his attainder; the second, letters patent brought by the Bishop of Durham, empowering him to exercise without restraint his functions as Legate. His progress from Gravesend to Whitehall, accordingly, resembled a triumphal procession, and on his arrival in the capital he was greeted with special honour by Philip and Mary. Writs, in which the title of "Supreme Head" was discarded, were forthwith issued for a third Parliament, to meet on November 12; and on the 27th the Legate delivered before the assembled members a Declaration, couched in highly figurative language, explanatory of the circumstances under which he had been sent, of the object of his coming, and of the powers with which he had been invested. At the conclusion of his address he was formally thanked by Gardiner, and after he had quitted the assembly the Chancellor declared that he had spoken as one inspired. On the following day the question was put to both Houses, whether England should return to the obedience of the Apostolic See? The affirmative was carried without a dissentient among the Peers, and with but two in the Commons On St Andrew's Day, Pole, on bended knee before Mary, presented her with the Supplication of the two Houses, "that they might receive absolution, and be readmitted into the body of the Holy Catholic Church, under the Pope, the Supreme Head thereof." After further formalities, and intercession made by King and Queen on behalf of the Houses, Pole pronounced the absolution and received the petitioners, by his authority as Legate, "again into the unity of our Mother the Holy Church."

The legislation of the two preceding reigns in all that related to the authority of the Roman see was now rescinded; and on Advent Sunday Gardiner, at Paul's Cross, in the presence of the King and the Legate, called upon the nation to rouse itself from the slumbers and delusions of the past years and to return to the true fold, while he himself at the same time abjured the doctrine set forth in his *De Vera Obedientia* and declared his unreserved submission to the papal power.

Another Supplication, and one of very different tenour, now issued from within those prison walls where the chief leaders of the Reformers were confined. It detailed the hardships to which they were subjected; claimed that the accusations brought against them should be distinctly stated, in order that they might be heard in their own defence; and, since it was as heretics that they had been singled out for imprisonment, they

urged that "heresy" should be legally defined. Parliament's response to this appeal was the re-enactment of three ancient statutes formerly in force against Lollardism. The measure passed rapidly through both Houses, the only opposition which it encountered proceeding from the Lords, where some objection was urged to the restoration of the old episcopal jurisdiction, while the penalties enacted were pronounced excessive. As the result of this legislation, John Rogers (the proto-martyr of the reign) died at the stake in the following February; and a series of like tragical scenes followed, in which the sufferings of the martyrs and the fortitude with which they were endured, combined to produce a widespread impression. So marked, indeed, was the popular sympathy, that Renard felt bound to suggest to Philip the employment of less extreme measures, "otherwise the heretics would take occasion to assert that the means employed by the Church to bring back perverts to the fold were, not teaching and example, but cruel punishments." He further advised that Pole should, from time to time, have audience of the Council and be consulted by them with regard to the penalties to be enforced. Unfortunately, neither Gardiner nor Pole was inclined from previous experience to advocate a lenient course. The former was especially anxious to give proof of the sincerity of his recent repudiation of his former tenets; the latter was scarcely less desirous of showing that under a gentle demeanour he was capable of cherishing a strong purpose. Five years before, when his merits as a candidate for the tiara were under discussion at the Conclave, it had been urged against Pole that when at Viterbo he had been wanting in the requisite severity towards obstinate heretics; and he had himself always claimed to have inclined to mercy when assisting at the conferences of the Council of Trent. But he was especially anxious at this time to leave no occasion for a similar reproach in England, and his discharge of his functions during the remainder of the reign cannot be regarded as lenient; although in Convocation, as late as January, 1555, he admonished the Bishops to use gentleness in their endeavours towards the reclaiming of heretics.

For the merciless severities which ensued, the violence of the more intolerant Reformers also afforded a partial extenuation; and it is now generally admitted that the part played by Bonner was not that attributed to him by Foxe, of a cruel bigot who exulted in sending his victims to the stake. The number of those put to death in his diocese of London was undoubtedly disproportionately large, but this would seem to have been more the result of the strength of the Reforming element in the capital and in Essex than to the employment of exceptional rigour; while the evidence also shows that he himself dealt patiently with many of the Protestants, and did his best to induce them to renounce what he conscientiously believed to be their errors.

In the course of 1555 events abroad brought about a further

modification of the relations of England with the Holy See. In February an embassy had been sent to Julius III, to make known to him the unreserved submission of the English Parliament. The ambassadors proceeded leisurely on their journey, and while still on the way were met by the tidings of the Pontiff's death, which had taken place on March 23. Charles forthwith sent an urgent request to Pole to repair to Rome, in order to support the imperial interests in the new election. The Cardinal, however, sought to be excused, on the ground that the negotiations for peace were even of yet greater importance for the welfare of Christendom. His friend, Cardinal Alessandro Farnese, hastened from Avignon to Rome, in order to support his claims in the Conclave, but Pole himself seemed, according to Michiel, without any personal ambition at this crisis. The efforts of France were forestalled by the election of Cardinal Corvini; but, before another three weeks had elapsed, Marcellus II himself was no more.

This second opportunity seemed both to Mary and to Gardiner one that should not be disregarded, and Pole's claims were now strongly urged; even Noailles admitted that no election was more likely to bring peace to Christendom, nor could he conceive of any other Pontiff who would hold the balance with such equal impartiality between France and the Empire. Again, however, the Italian party triumphed; and even Pole himself may have questioned the wisdom of his abstention when Gian Pietro Caraffa (now in his eightieth year) succeeded as Paul IV to the papal chair. The house of Caraffa was Neapolitan and had long been on friendly terms with France, while it cherished a corresponding hereditary enmity towards Spain. Paul could remember Italy in the days of her freedom, and his hatred of the Spanish domination had been intensified by not unfrequent collisions with the imperial representatives in the Neapolitan territory, and not least by the strenuous efforts they had made to defeat his election to the Archbishopric of Naples. The bestowal of Milan and the crown of Italy on Philip, on his betrothal to Mary, had still further roused Caraffa's ire. Paul, indeed, did not scruple to accuse Charles of dealing leniently with heretics in order to show his aversion from the Roman policy. Before the year 1555 closed he had concluded a secret treaty with France, which had for its special object the expulsion of the imperialist forces from the Italian peninsula. Charles, when informed by the Nuncio of the election, blandly observed that he could well remember, when himself a boy of fourteen, hearing the new Pope sing mass at Brussels. Michiel, however, to whom Philip at Hampton Court communicated the intelligence, could perceive that neither the King himself nor those "Spanish gentlemen" with whom he found the opportunity of conversing at Richmond were pleased, and says plainly: "they by no means approve of this election." In the same letter (June 6) he informs the Doge, that "Her Majesty expects and hopes during this week to comfort the realm by an auspicious delivery";

although he adds that this is earlier than the ladies of the bedchamber anticipate.

On Hampton Court, whither, some two months before, Sir Henry Bedingfield had conducted the Princess Elizabeth, the main interest of the English nation now became concentrated; and probably no period in her whole life was marked by more torturing doubt and anxiety. Her days passed in almost complete solitude; Gardiner, the Earl of Arundel, and other members of the Council were her only visitors; the object of their visits, as she soon became painfully aware, being to draw from her some unguarded expression which might be construed into an admission of her complicity in the insurrection. Their design, however, was baffled by her indignant and persistent denials; and when, early in July, Mary accorded her captive an interview, Elizabeth again, and in yet stronger language, asseverated her entire innocence. A visit from the King, addressing her with respectful demeanour and kindly words, encouraged while it somewhat mystified her; but before another ten days had passed away the sagacious Princess could easily interpret the change of purpose which his bearing had then indicated.

It now became known that Mary had been under a complete delusion, and that there would probably be no offspring from the royal marriage. Elizabeth's supporters at once took heart again, as they realised the change which had supervened in regard to her future prospects. They appeared in London in high spirits and large numbers, so comporting themselves, indeed, that the Council, in alarm, ordered the more prominent among them to retire to their estates, as suspected heretics and leagued with rebels. But Elizabeth herself was set at liberty and sought again her former seclusion at Ashridge, and, as Mary slowly awoke from her fond dream of maternity, Philip, freed from the obligation which had detained him at her side, began to advert to continental politics and to plead that the affairs of the Continent demanded his personal supervision abroad Before, however, quitting his island kingdom, he deemed it necessary to advise his consort with respect to the treatment of Elizabeth during his absence—advice which differed materially from that given by his father. It was no longer suggested that political exigencies might call for the sacrifice of a sister's life. On the contrary, Mary was now recommended to extend all possible indulgence to the Princess, and the changed conditions of Elizabeth's existence became obvious even to the public at large; nor did intelligent observers require to be reminded that the daughter of Anne Boleyn was the only barrier to the succession of Mary Stewart, the betrothed of the future French monarch, to the throne of England.

But round the present occupant of that throne the clouds were gathering more darkly than before, and Mary's temper and health were visibly affected by the wanton imputations directed against both herself and Philip. Among the Spanish party, not a little chagrined at the

royal disillusionment, there were those who represented the young King as the victim of a designing woman, and who affected to believe that Mary's pretended pregnancy was a mere device to detain her husband by her side. The Council, on the other hand, had to listen to allegations which asserted that the King, despairing of a lineal succession, was meditating a *coup de main*, by bringing over large bodies of Spanish troops and occupying the harbours and ports, and thus realising the long-suspected design of the Habsburg,—the reduction of England to a dependency of Spain. Both Charles and Philip, again, became aware that with Mary's vanished hopes a considerable advantage in their negotiations with France had also disappeared; and the malicious exultation of Noailles knew no bounds Rarely in the annals of royalty in England had satire and ridicule been at once so rancorous and so unmerited. The haughty Habsburg, acutely sensitive, under a seemingly impassive exterior, to all that affected his personal dignity, determined to quit the country, and, in obedience to his father's behest, to devote himself to the affairs of those vast possessions which he was soon to be called upon to rule. On August 28, 1555, Philip sailed for the Low Countries.

The incidents which preceded his departure are described in detail by Michiel. Before embarking, the King summoned the lords of the Council to the Council Chamber, and there handed them a series of suggestions for the government of the realm during his absence, together with a list of names of those whom he deemed most eligible for the conduct of affairs. If we may credit the Venetian envoy, the judgment and ability displayed in this document excited the approval and admiration of all who perused it. At Greenwich, where Philip embarked, he took leave of Mary at the head of the staircase of their apartments; the Queen maintaining her self-possession until he was gone, and then giving way to uncontrollable grief. Pole, whom the King had designated as her chief counsellor, was indeed now the only adviser to whom she could turn with any confidence, and her sense of loneliness and desertion was intense. The Cardinal, touched by her pitiable condition, compiled a short prayer for her use during her husband's absence.

The departure of Philip was, however, perfectly justified by the pressing state of affairs at the imperial Court, whither he had already received more than one urgent summons from his father. Charles' health was giving way, and, although only in his fifty-sixth year, he was already contemplating retirement to "our kingdoms of Spain," there "to pass the rest of our life in repose and tranquillity." But before this could be, it was imperative that he should make the necessary dispositions for the succession in his own imperial domains, while he also aspired to arrange, if possible, for the regal succession in England. Although no reasonable hope of issue from his son's marriage could now be entertained, the astute Emperor would not abandon his project

of securing the English Crown to his own House without a final effort; and he now proposed that the Princess Elizabeth should be betrothed to his nephew, the Archduke Ferdinand. But in return for the accession of territory and influence that would thus accrue to the Austrian branch, he insisted that Philip should receive for Italy the title of "Vicar of the Empire," implying the delegation of the supreme imperial power. The objections of Ferdinand prevented the public execution of this stipulation, which was however later secretly carried out. For a time, indeed, it was currently reported that Ferdinand's succession to the Empire itself was in jeopardy; a coolness arose between the two brothers; and when on October 25, 1555, Charles made a formal surrender at Brussels of his Flemish provinces to his son, neither the King of the Romans nor his son Maximilian appeared in the august assemblage. The ceremony took place in the Town Hall of the capital, where Charles, taking his seat on his throne, with Philip on his right hand and Mary, the late Regent of the Low Countries, on his left, and surrounded by his nobles and ministers of State and the delegates of the provinces, formally ceded to his son, the "King of England and of Naples," the entire surrounding territories—"the duchies, marquisates, principalities, counties, baronies, lordships, villages, castles, and fortresses therein, together with all the royalties."

It can scarcely be deemed surprising if, amid these new and vast responsibilities, Philip's insular kingdom and its lonely Queen might seem at times forgotten; or that Charles, whose design it had been to set out for Spain as soon as possible, found his departure unavoidably retarded until the year 1556 was far advanced. But in the February of that year the Truce of Vaucelles ended for a time the hostilities with France, Henry thereby retaining possession of the entire territories of the Duke of Savoy. With his habitual want of good faith, however, the French monarch did not scruple, whenever an opportunity presented itself, still secretly to foment insurrection against both Philip and Mary in their respective domains.

At length, on August 9, the Emperor finally quitted Brussels, and embarked, a month later, for Spain. His departure was pathetically deprecated and deplored by Mary, who, now guided almost solely by Pole, had during the previous year been directing her main efforts to the suppression of heresy within her realm.

The entire number of those who thus suffered during her reign was less than 400,—a number which appears small when contrasted with the thousands who had already died in a like cause in Provence, or who were destined to do so in the Low Countries. But the social eminence, high character, and personal popularity of not a few of the English martyrs, unalloyed, as in many cases these qualities were, with political disaffection, served to invest their fate with a peculiar interest in the eyes

of their fellow-countrymen,—an interest which Foxe's *Book of Martyrs*, chained to the "eagle brass" of many a parish church, did much to perpetuate. The prominence thus secured for that partial record was the means of winning for its contents an amount of attention from later historical writers greatly in excess of its actual merits. It needed, however, neither misrepresentation nor partisanship to gain for many of the martyrs of Mary's reign the deep sympathy of observant contemporaries. John Rogers, once a prebendary of St Paul's and lecturer on divinity, followed to the stake by his wife and children, nerved by their exhortations, and expiring unmoved and unshaken before their gaze,—the reasonable defence and legally strong position of Robert Ferrar, the former Bishop of St David's,—the transparent honesty and scholarly acumen of John Bradford,—the fine qualities and youthful heroism of Thomas Hawkes (whom Bonner himself would gladly have screened),—all commanded sympathy and were entirely dissociated from that political discontent which undoubtedly called for prompt and stern repression.

With regard however to the three distinguished martyrs, who died at Oxford, there was a wide difference. In proportion to their eminence had been their offence as contumacious offenders. Cranmer, as signatory to the late King's will and thereby participant in the diversion of the Succession as well as in the actual plot on behalf of the Lady Jane, had two years before been condemned to suffer the penalty of high treason. And although the extreme penalty had been remitted, the sentence had carried with it the forfeiture of his archbishopric, and he remained a prisoner in the Tower. His captivity was shared by Ridley and Latimer, of whom the former had been scarcely less conspicuous in his support of the Lady Jane, while the latter, as far back as the reign of Henry, had been, for a time, a prisoner within the same walls, denounced as active in "moving tumults in the State." Had it not been for Wyatt's conspiracy they would probably have regained their freedom; but with that experience Mary came to the conclusion that her past clemency had been a mistaken policy, and in conjunction with Pole she now resolved to show no leniency to those convicted of heretical doctrine Such a mode of procedure was convenient when compared with prosecutions for treason, as at once less costly, more expeditious, and allowing the use of evidence afforded by the culprits themselves. It was also certain that not one of the three distinguished ecclesiastics would have ventured to deny that heresy was an offence which called for the severest penalties. Cranmer, in conjunction with his chaplain Ridley, had pronounced sentence in 1549 on Joan Bocher, and in doing so had been perfectly aware that her condemnation involved her death by burning at the hands of the secular power. Ridley in his notable sermon at Paul's Cross in 1553 had denounced Mary as a usurper, not on the ground of the illegality of her succession but as one altogether intractable in matters of "truth, faith and obedience." Latimer, when Bishop of

Worcester, had expressed his unreserved approval of a sentence whereby a number of Anabaptists perished at the stake; and, on the occasion when Friar Forest met with a like fate for denying the supremacy claimed by Henry VIII, had preached against the papal claims to spiritual jurisdiction in England. Accordingly, just as the Reformers had resorted to political rebellion in order to bring about the downfall of theological error, so the Crown now sought to punish political disaffection on the grounds of religious heresy. The power which invoked the law could also enforce its own definition of the offence.

The Reformers had however frequently complained that they suffered persecution as heretics, while the exact nature of their offence remained itself undefined. It was accordingly resolved that no doubt should be suffered to remain in the cases of Latimer, Cranmer, and Ridley:—out of their own mouths should their condemnation be justified. Such was the design with which, in March, 1554, they were brought from the Tower to Oxford, and there called upon to defend, in a formal disputation, their doctrine respecting the Mass. Nor would it have been easy to take exception to the right of these three eminent men to represent the tenets of their party. The first had been Bishop of Worcester in the reign of Henry; the second had filled the see of Canterbury for more than twenty years; the third had been Bishop of London, and in that capacity had assisted at the deprivation of Bonner (his predecessor, and now his successor), and also at that of Gardiner. All three again had filled positions of importance in their University of Cambridge, and were presumed to be masters of dialectical disputation; just as their opponents, who were eleven in number, had been selected from the two Universities. Latimer, however, was now in his seventieth year, and it was no reflexion on his courage that he declined an ordeal in which quickness of apprehension and a ready memory were essentials. The disputation was, however, vigorously maintained by Cranmer and Ridley in conflict with their numerous antagonists. But they did so only to be pronounced defeated; and after proceedings which extended over six days, they were recommitted to "Bocardo," as the common gaol was designated (in allusion to a logical position from which a disputant finds it impossible to extricate himself). The condemnation involved the assumption that doctrines of faith and practice were amenable to the decisions of casuistry rather than to the teaching of Scripture, and was therefore contrary to the principles of the more advanced Reformers.

The captives succeeded in corresponding with each other and coming to an understanding with respect to a declaration of their distinctive tenets (May, 1554). Among other leading divines then suffering imprisonment were three of the Bishops created in Edward's reign,—John Hooper of Exeter, Robert Ferrar of St David's, and Miles Coverdale of Exeter, and well-known Reformers, such as Rowland Taylor, John Philpot, John Bradford, and Edward Crome. But none of these were

comparable for learning, dialectical capacity, and intellectual acumen with the three Bishops whose doctrines already stood condemned; and, when the other Reformers learnt that they were to be called upon to face a similar ordeal, they anticipated such a requirement by an intimation that they would not consent to engage in a formal disputation but were willing to set forth their views and defend them in writing.

They also explained what their leading tenets were:—the acceptance of the doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, the repudiation of the doctrines of Purgatory and transubstantiation, together with the adoration of the Host, clerical celibacy, and Latin services. They, however, professed unqualified loyalty to the Queen and deprecated all conspiracies against her authority. With respect to this manifesto no action appears to have been taken; but the petitioners were still detained in captivity, and before the year closed Parliament enacted afresh the ancient laws against Lollardism, including Archbishop Arundel's notorious statute *de haeretico comburendo*, all of which had been abolished by Somerset. Conscious of the net which was being drawn around them, and that their heresy was becoming a question of life or death, the captives instructed John Bradford to draw up in their name a new Declaration, couched however in far from conciliatory terms. As against the newly enacted laws of Richard II and his two successors, they appealed to Parliament to re-enact the "many godly laws touching the true religion of Christ" set forth in the two preceding reigns "by two most noble Kings"; laws which, they affirmed, had been passed only after much discussion among the doctors of Cambridge and Oxford, and with the cordial and full assent of the whole realm. Not a single parish in England, they declared, was desirous of a return to "the Romish superstitions and vain service" which had recently been introduced. They maintained that the homilies and services adopted during King Edward's reign were truly Catholic, and were ready to prove them so; or, if they failed in this, to give their bodies to be burned as the Lollard laws prescribed.

The Parliament to which the petitioners appealed gave no response to their supplication, although a spirit of reaction is distinctly discernible in the Commons during this session. That body had shown a marked disinclination to re-enact the laws against Lollardism, and although it had consented to annul the ecclesiastical legislation of Henry VIII, so far as this affected the papal prerogatives and authority, it had confirmed institutions and individuals alike in their possession of the property which Henry had wrested from the Church. In the event, again, of the royal marriage being blessed with offspring, Philip had been appointed Regent, should he survive his consort; but his regency was to last only so long as the minority of their child, and was to carry with it the obligation to reside in England. And finally, it was decided that the articles of the marriage treaty were to continue in full

force, while the proposal that Philip himself should be honoured with a solemn coronation was rejected. Altogether, there had been much to remind the King of certain essential differences between monarchy in Spain and monarchy in England. And when on January 16, 1555, the dissolution of Parliament took place, Noailles could note, with malicious satisfaction, the smallness of the retinue which accompanied the sovereigns to the House of Lords and the dissatisfaction shown in the House itself by both Mary and her Consort.

After a painful and ignominious imprisonment extending over more than two years, the three Bishops found themselves in September, 1555, again seated in the Divinity School at Oxford, awaiting their trial for the heresies of which they had already been convicted. The conduct of the proceedings was entrusted to a Commission appointed by the Legate; and Cranmer, the first who was formally summoned, stood with his head covered, pleading at the outset that he had sworn never to admit the authority of the Bishop of Rome in England, and at the same time refusing to recognise that of the Bishop of Gloucester, who had been appointed to preside over the proceedings, as his lawful judge. Fresh charges, among them his marriage, were now brought against him; he was then cited, as a Metropolitan, to appear within eighty days in Rome to answer all accusations, and was finally consigned again to Bocardo. Ridley and Latimer were to be more summarily dealt with. Pole, indeed, sent Fray de Soto, who had been appointed to fill the Hebrew chair at Oxford in the absence of Richard Bruern, to argue with them. But it was of no avail, and both perished at the same stake, "to light," as Latimer himself there expressed it, "such a candle in England as should never be put out." Cranmer, who, from a tower above his prison chamber, witnessed their dying agonies, showed less resolution; and when Fray de Garcia, the newly appointed Regius Professor of Divinity, was sent to ply him with further arguments, he wavered, and admitted that even the papal supremacy, now that it had been recognised by King, Queen, and Parliament, appeared to him in a new light. He was at last induced to sign a recantation, declaratory of his submission to the Pope as Supreme Head of the Catholic Church, and to the reigning sovereigns of his country and their laws. His formal degradation, however, which took place on February 14, opened his eyes to the fact that he had no mercy to look for at the hands of the papal delegates; and as his crozier was wrested from his grasp, and the mock vestments which symbolised his whole ecclesiastical career were successively removed from his person, and the pallium taken away, he resisted forcibly, at the same time producing from his sleeve a document in which he formally appealed from Paul IV to the next General Council. Prior to this ceremony he had for a few weeks been consigned to the care of the Dean of Christchurch and had lived in the enjoyment of every comfort; but he was now once more consigned to Bocardo. There, the terror of death came back,

and he was induced to transcribe and sign other recantations. Eventually, however, in the Church of St Mary, on the day appointed for his execution, when a full and complete declaration of his penitence which should edify the religious world was expected, he astonished his audience by a complete disavowal of all his previous recantations, which were no less than six in number; and, when he was led forth to die, his vacillation in the prison was forgotten in his heroism at the stake. Suffering, ostensibly, as a heretic, Cranmer really expiated by his death the share which he had taken in procuring Henry's first divorce.

To the reactionary feelings which were discernible in Mary's third Parliament the martyrdoms that had taken place between February and October, 1555, had lent no slight additional strength; while those of Ridley and Latimer, only a few days before the assembling of her fourth Parliament on October 21, must have been especially fresh in men's memories. The attention of the new House was first invited to the needs of the royal exchequer, and Gardiner, as Chancellor, exerted all his powers to induce the assembly to grant a substantial subsidy. His demands were acceded to, although not without some opposition; and the gift of a million pounds—the payment of which, in the case of the laity, was to be extended over two years, in that of the clergy, over four—gave promise of effective relief; the latter body, if we may credit Pole, accepting their share of the burden with exemplary cheerfulness. To Mary, however, this satisfactory result must have appeared dearly purchased, involving as it did the loss of her Chancellor. In urging upon Parliament the necessities of the realm, Gardiner's oratorical efforts, combined with the dropsy from which he was suffering, brought on complete exhaustion; and although he sufficiently recovered to admit not only of his removal from Whitehall to Winchester House, but even of his presence at the Cabinet Councils which the ministers came from Greenwich to attend, it soon became apparent that his days were numbered. On November 12 he died. The reports which gained credit among his enemies, of his penitence and self-reproach in his last hours, have been shown by circumstantial evidence to be fabrications. Michiel, one of the least prejudiced, as he was certainly one of the most competent, observers, recalls the late Chancellor's untiring energy, wide practical knowledge, keen insight into character, and consummate tact, and represents his loss as irreparable; an estimate which the undisguised joy of the French party at the event seems only to confirm. The great prelate was ultimately laid to rest in his own Cathedral, to which he had bequeathed a third of his private fortune, and where his chantry chapel, in the Renaissance style, still preserves his memory.

On the day preceding Gardiner's death a bill was read in the House of Lords whereby the Crown surrendered into the hands of the Roman pontiff the first-fruits and tenths of all ecclesiastical benefices—for "the discharge of our conscience," as Mary subsequently expressed it in a

series of instructions which she placed in the hands of Pole. But the bill when it came down to the Commons at once gave rise to a warm discussion, and was eventually carried against an ominous minority of 126. Six days later (December 9), Mary dissolved Parliament; and two years elapsed before it met again.

In the meantime the royal purpose was becoming more inexorable and pronounced. In the communications to Pole, above referred to, Mary gave it as her opinion that it would "be well to inflict punishment" on those "who choose by their false doctrine to deceive simple persons." It was, however, her express desire that no one should be burnt in London "save in the presence of some member of the Council," and that during such executions some "good and pious sermons should be preached." It was probably under the belief that Pole's better nature would exert a certain influence, that Philip, when he departed for the Low Countries, had advised Mary to take the Cardinal for her chief counsellor. But firmness was never one of Pole's virtues, and when confronted by a stronger will, in conjunction with that more practical knowledge of men and affairs in which he was notoriously deficient, he deferred to the judgment of others and reluctantly acquiesced in a policy which he himself would never have originated. But he still at times vacillated; and, as we have already noted, would recommend the Bishops to have recourse to gentle methods in their endeavours to reclaim heretics; while in August, 1556, he succeeded in setting free no less than twenty prisoners whom Bonner had condemned to the stake. It was possibly in anticipation of his resignation of the office of *legatus a latere* that Pole aspired to succeed Gardiner as Privy Seal, for the incompatibility of the two offices was obvious; the seal was ultimately, at Philip's suggestion, bestowed on Lord Paget, who, as a layman and a statesman of known tolerance in religious questions, succeeded on January 29, 1556. The Chancellorship was not bestowed on Thirlby, now Bishop of Ely, who had been discharging its duties as deputy and whose claims were favoured by Mary—his known Catholic sympathies rendering it inadvisable, even in the eyes of Philip, to continue him in the office; and on January 1, the Great Seal was conferred on Heath, Archbishop of York. Pole, however, succeeded Gardiner as Chancellor of the University of Cambridge; and on March 22, 1556, the day after Cranmer was burnt at Oxford, he was consecrated to the Archbishopric of Canterbury.

Under his auspices, and with the aid of the royal munificence, several of the foundations which had been swept away by Mary's father in his anger at their contumacious resistance to his arbitrary decrees now rose again. The Grey Friars reappeared at Greenwich, the Carthusians gathered once more in their splendid monastery at Sheen, the Brigettines reassembled at Sion; while Feckenham, abandoning his deanery at St Paul's, made his solemn entry into Westminster as Abbot of a body

of Benedictine monks who took the places of the expelled canons. Parliament had ceased from troubling; and, with the false teachers silenced, the heretical books suppressed, the authority of the ecclesiastical courts re-established, the new Primate might almost flatter himself that the ideal conditions contemplated in his *Reformatio Angliae* had become an accomplished reality. The denunciation of the Dudley conspiracy rudely dispelled this pleasing vision. On Easter Eve, April 4, 1556, official intelligence was received of a new plot, having for its aim the seizing of Mary's person and her deposition, in order to make way for Elizabeth, who was to marry, not Ferdinand, but Courtenay;—a name still potent to conjure with, although the unfortunate nobleman was himself unambitious of the honour and then nearing his end, which came to him in the following September near Padua.

The plot itself, in its origin, was not suggestive of any very deep or widespread agencies, being the outcome of a series of meetings among some country gentlemen in Oxfordshire and Berkshire,—Sir Anthony Kingston, Sir Nicholas Throckmorton (a friend of Courtenay's, who had already been pardoned for complicity in Wyatt's rebellion), Sir Henry Peckham, and Sir Henry Dudley, a relative of the late Duke of Northumberland. Further evidence, however, obtained at a considerable interval, implicated not only Noailles, the ambassador, with whom Dudley was in correspondence, but also Henry, at whose Court Dudley had been received and his proposals favourably considered, and finally Elizabeth herself. The fact that, in the preceding February, Charles and Philip had concluded at Vaucelles a truce with Henry, which was to last for five years and included important concessions to France, showed the faithlessness of the French monarch. Henry, however, advised the conspirators to defer the execution of their plans, and to their disregard of this advice the collapse of the whole scheme appears to have been mainly attributable

Among the arrests made in England were those of two members of Elizabeth's own household; of these a son of Sir Edmund Peckham (one of Mary's staunchest supporters) turned King's evidence and his testimony chiefly implicated Elizabeth. Again, however, Philip exerted his influence for her protection, while the Princess asseverated her innocence. It was at this juncture, May 25, that Noailles himself requested to be recalled; he had indeed some fear of being arrested by order of the Privy Council. His place at the English Court was temporarily taken by a brother, a councillor of the *Parlement* of Bordeaux; and it was not until November 2 that Soranzo was able to report the arrival of the more distinguished brother, François, the protonotary, and Bishop of Acqs or Dax, in the same capacity. To François de Noailles Elizabeth confided her design of seeking an asylum in France; he however strongly dissuaded her from such a step, suggesting that her best policy would be to remain in England. In after years the

Bishop of Acqs was wont to boast that Elizabeth was indebted to him for her crown.

Lord Clinton had been instructed to make a formal protest at the French Court against the countenance which Henry afforded to the English malcontents; but his remonstrance only drew from the King the splenetic observation that they were so numerous that they "filled not only France but the whole of Italy." In the Italian peninsula, indeed, Philip now found himself involved in relations far from amicable with the reigning Pontiff. Caraffa's aggressive nature did not dispose him to judge charitably of others, while he was believed by Philip to harbour designs against his Neapolitan kingdom. The Pope was especially indignant when he heard of the Truce of Vaucelles; and, when in June, 1556, despatches were intercepted at Terracina sent from the Spanish envoy in Rome to Alva, Philip's viceroy in Naples, describing the defenceless condition of the papal territory, his suspicions became certainty. In the ensuing month his nephew, Cardinal Caraffa, arrived in Paris to concert measures with Henry for expelling the Spaniard altogether from Italy. The personal ambition of the Guises favoured the Pontiff's projects, and war was ultimately resolved on. Paul cited both Charles and Philip before him as vassals who had been unfaithful to their feudal obligations, pronounced the latter deprived of his kingdom of Sicily, and detained the Spanish envoy a prisoner at St Angelo. Alva issued a counter manifesto and conducted his army into the papal territory, while late in December the Duke of Guise in turn made a rejoinder by crossing the Alps at the head of a considerable force.

Such was broadly the political situation in Europe when the year 1557 opened; England appearing leagued with Spain, on the one hand, against France aided by the temporal power of the Roman Pontiff on the other; while Englishmen in turn were divided between sympathy with those of their countrymen who had fled from persecution, and resentment at the manner in which they had deserted to the common foe.

At Calais and throughout the English Pale the exiles were now discovered to be concerting with the native Huguenot element the surrender to Henry of two important fortresses, those of Guines and Hames (between Guines and Calais),—a design which was defeated only by its timely discovery. It was at this juncture that Philip crossed over to Dover and from thence proceeded to Greenwich, where Mary was residing. Two days later the royal pair passed through London to Whitehall amid the acclamations of the citizens. The King's stay extended over nearly four months (March 18—July 3), and to the majority his visit appeared singularly opportune. The immediate object of his visit—to induce Mary to join him in his impending war with France—was one in favour of which his arguments might well appear irresistible. The Duke of Guise had already overrun

his Neapolitan territory; and it seemed probable that the King of France would shortly conquer, if not vigorously opposed, all that was still English within the limits of his realm. Again, and for the last time, Pole found himself involved in relations of difficulty with the House of Habsburg; and he was under the necessity of privately explaining by letter to Philip that diplomatic etiquette forbade that the Legate of the Holy Father should meet his master's declared enemy; whereupon he withdrew quietly to Canterbury. In April, however, his embarrassment received an unlooked for solution, by Paul's peremptory recall of his Legates from the whole of Philip's dominions; and when King and Queen joined in urging that the actual condition of England made the presence of a Legate exceptionally necessary, the Pope at first sought to evade compliance by offering to appoint a *legatus natus* and to attach the office to the Archbishopric of Canterbury. Eventually, however, in a Consistory convened on June 14, he appointed William Peto, Mary's former confessor; thus substituting, as Phillips, Pole's biographer, indignantly expresses it, a begging friar for the royally descended Cardinal! At the same time, the merciless Pontiff cruelly wounded his former Legate's sensitive spirit by insinuating that he was a heretic. Pole expostulated in an *Apology*, extending over eighty folio pages, vindicatory of his whole career; but Paul never revoked the imputation, which darkened the Cardinal's remaining days.

While, in the meantime, Philip and his Queen were concerting measures with the Council, tidings arrived which imparted fresh force to the Pope's representations. On April 24 Thomas Stafford, a nephew of Pole and a grandson of the last Duke of Buckingham, had set sail with two ships from Dieppe and, having landed unopposed on the Yorkshire coast, had seized Scarborough Castle. Thence he issued a proclamation, announcing that he had come to deliver England from the tyranny of the foreigner and to defeat "the most devilish devices" of Mary. The rebellion, if such it could be termed,—for Stafford's appeal met with but slight response,—was speedily suppressed, Wotton's vigilance having given the government early intimation of his sailing; and its leader with a few of his personal adherents were captured by the Earl of Westmorland and sent to London. Stafford was found guilty of high treason, and suffered the punishment of a traitor at Tyburn (May 28). Henry, who designated Stafford as "that fool" and repudiated all knowledge of his mad undertaking, had probably full information of what was intended; and on June 7 war with France was declared. Affecting to regard this step as simply further evidence of "the Queen of England's submission to her husband's will," Henry at once ordered his ambassador at her Court to present his letters of recall, but François de Noailles had already been dismissed by Mary. On his way back to Paris, the latter stayed at Calais and made a careful survey of the fortifications; the ruinous condition of the outer wall

more especially attracted his attention; and on his arrival in the capital and being admitted to an interview with the King, he expressed his belief that a sudden attack made by an adequate force on that ancient seaport would carry all before it.

Before Philip quitted England he received the gratifying intelligence that Alva's Fabian tactics had been successful against Guise, and that he had been finally driven from the Neapolitan territory. The mortification of Paul was equally intense, for he had scrupled at nothing to bring about an opposite result: had suggested to Solyman a descent on the Two Sicilies, and had brought over mercenaries from Protestant Germany,—and all this in order to defeat the forces of the eldest son of the Church! When the Duke of Guise appeared to present his letters of recall the Pope's fury passed all bounds of decorum: "You have done little for your King, less for the Church, and for your own honour nothing." Such were Paul's parting words, although he little deemed how complete and how lasting the failure of the French intervention was to prove, and that the Habsburg rule was destined to remain unshaken, alike in the north and south of the Italian land, until the war of the Spanish Succession.

On his return to Brussels Philip was accompanied by Michiel Surian, who had been appointed ambassador to his Court, and the Venetian Republic henceforth maintained no resident envoy in England. Of English affairs it had recently received the elaborate "Report" drawn up by Giovanni Michiel, and presented to the Doge and Senate in the preceding May. The King's first attention was now directed to the war with France, to which he addressed himself with unwonted energy. The signal victory of his arms at St Quentin, achieved mainly by a powerful division of Spanish cavalry, was attended by the capture of Montmorency, the French general, and the dispersion, with great slaughter, of his entire army; and three weeks later, St Quentin, which barred the road to Paris, was surrendered by Coligny. The news was received with great rejoicings in London, where a solemn *Te Deum* was sung; and Pole, at Mary's request, conveyed her congratulations to her husband. The conclusion of his letter is noteworthy: "We are anxiously expecting news of some good agreement with his Holiness, which may our Lord God deign to grant." With the Colonna already at the gates of Rome, even Paul himself now became aware that to yield was inevitable. Rarely however has the victor used his success with greater consideration for the vanquished. When Naples and its territory had been brought back to submission, Alva repaired to Rome, and, escorted by the papal guard into the Pontiff's presence-chamber, there fell upon his knees, imploring pardon for having dared, even at the command of his temporal sovereign, to bear arms against the Church, and was formally absolved. And again in London there were bonfires and illuminations in celebration of a peace,—the peace thus effected between Philip and the Papacy.

Although Mary is described by Michiel in his "Report" as friendly to the Scotch, the aid which she afforded Philip in his war with France almost necessarily involved hostilities with the former nation, in whose midst Mary of Lorraine, as Regent, had been for some time past installing her countrymen in official posts with undisguised partiality. The betrothal of the Queen of Scots to the Dauphin and the intimate relations which the Regent had throughout maintained with the French Court, served still further to strengthen the political alliance between the two countries. It was consequently no surprise when, in October, 1557, it became known in London that the Regent had built a fortress to prevent English forces from marching to the relief of Berwick; that Scottish troops were ravaging the country south of the Tweed; that there had been a massacre of some English troops which had ventured to land in the Orkneys; and that a battle between the forces of the two nations on the frontier was regarded as imminent. The intelligence of the great disaster sustained by the French arms at St Quentin gave pause, however, to the Scottish ardour. A Council was convened in the church at Eckford, where the expediency of continuing the war was discussed, the decision being in the negative. The invading force was consequently disbanded, having achieved little more than the distraction, for a short time, of the attention of England from the war with France, and a certain addition to her military expenses. On April 24, 1558, the marriage of Mary Queen of Scots with the Dauphin was celebrated with great splendour in Notre Dame; and to not a few it seemed that France, by a less costly process than armed conquest, had effected a virtual annexation of Scotland. In the following November the National Council, assembled at the Palace of Holyrood, decided to confer on the King-Dauphin (as Francis was now termed in Paris) the Crown matrimonial.

At nearly the same time that François de Noailles' account of the neglected condition of Calais was communicated to Henry, Michiel, in his "Report," had described the town as an almost impregnable fortress, garrisoned by 500 soldiers and by a troop of 50 horse. Writing on January 4, 1558, he had to inform the Doge and Council of Ten that the capture of Calais was imminent; two days later, Lord Wentworth, notwithstanding his gallant defence, was compelled to surrender to the Duke of Guise, the only condition that he could obtain being that the lives of the inhabitants and of the garrison were to be spared. They were allowed, however, to take nothing with them, the soldiery giving up their arms, the citizens all their worldly possessions. A fortnight later the garrisons of Guines and Hames also surrendered, although on somewhat less humiliating terms. The expelled population of Calais betook themselves mostly to England, where their destitute and homeless condition served still further to increase the widespread indignation at the supineness and stupidity, as well as the suspected treachery, whereby the last stronghold of English power in France had been irrevocably lost.

Early in the year Mary again became a prey to the delusion that she was about to become a mother, and Philip was at once informed. He affected to entertain no misgiving, and before the end of January the Count de Feria, who had married Jane Dormer, one of the Queen's maids of honour, was sent over to convey the King's congratulations. England was already known to the new ambassador, who now assumed a foremost place among the royal counsellors. De Feria, however, had conceived a thorough contempt alike for English institutions and the English character. He had been instructed especially to urge two important measures—the equipment of a fleet for the defence of the coasts and the enrolment of an army to guard the Scotch marches; and he was unable to comprehend the slowness of the process by which the necessary supplies were eventually raised, when he also noted the apparent affluence and well-being of London and the surrounding districts. Like Antoine de Noailles before him, he pronounced the English character to be singularly changeable and wanting in firmness of purpose. His surprise, however, must be interpreted as illustrating rather the relative comfort in which the population lived, as compared with the invariably scanty fare and wretched huts of the people in Spain. Otherwise, the prevalence of ague fever,—an epidemic which raged with terrible fatality in the summer and autumn of the years 1557 and 1558,—together with the dearness of corn, the languishing state of trade and agriculture, and the heaviness of taxation, contributed to render the general condition of the country depressing in the extreme; while the popular dissatisfaction became further intensified, when it was known that Philip was employing the new marine exclusively for his own purposes.

The disappointment and chagrin which weighed on Mary's spirits during the last few months of her life were deepened by her increasing ill health; and her morbid condition both of mind and body appeared to not a few to be finding expression in the revival of religious persecution. But the recurrence of secret meetings, open manifestations of fierce discontent, together with the malevolence which assailed Spaniards even in the streets of the capital, may be accepted as affording a sufficient explanation of the renewed severities which marked the administration of Bonner's Court, where treason and heresy had become almost synonymous. Although, however, opinion may differ with respect to the degree and character of the chief influences in operation, it is undeniable that feelings of aversion on the part of the people from foreign rule and papal authority, and of sullen resentment at the humiliation of the English name and the squandering of the national resources, were alike becoming intensified, when, in the early morning of November 17, Mary of England passed away, to be followed a few hours later by Archbishop Pole—both eminent examples of the inadequacy of deep convictions and pious motives to guide the State aright.

CHAPTER XVI.

THE ANGLICAN SETTLEMENT AND THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

When at the beginning of 1560 there was a new Pope, pledged to convoke the Council for a third time and to stem and repel the tide of heresy, the latest disaster that met his eye was no mere relapse of England followed by a lapse of Scotland; for what was shaping itself in the northern seas already looked ominously like a Protestant Great Britain. Two small Catholic Powers traditionally at war with each other, the one a satellite of the Habsburg luminary, the other a satellite of France, seemed to be fusing themselves in one Power that might be very great: great perhaps for good, but more probably for evil. "Earnest embracing of religion," wrote a Scottish to an English statesman, "will join us straitly together." The religion that William Maitland meant when he sent these words to Sir William Cecil was not the religion of Pius IV and the General Council.

Suddenly all farsighted eyes had turned to a backward country. Eyes at Rome and eyes at Geneva were fixed on Scotland, and, the further they could peer into the future, the more eager must have been their gaze. And still we look intently at that wonderful scene, the Scotland of Mary Stewart and John Knox: not merely because it is such glorious tragedy, but also because it is such modern history. The fate of the Protestant Reformation was being decided, and the creed of unborn millions in undiscovered lands was being determined. This we see—all too plainly perhaps—if we read the books that year by year men still are writing of Queen Mary and her surroundings. The patient analysis of those love letters in the casket may yet be perturbed by thoughts about religion. Nor is the religious the only interest. A new nation, a British nation, was in the making.

We offer no excuse for having as yet said little of Scotland. Called upon to play for some years a foremost part in the great drama, her entry upon the stage of modern history is late and sudden. In such phrases there must indeed be some untruth, for history is not drama. The annals of Scotland may be so written that the story will be

continuous enough. We may see the explosion of 1559 as the effect of causes that had long been at work. We might chronicle the remote beginnings of heresy and the first glimmers of the New Learning. All those signs of the times that we have seen elsewhere in capital letters we might see here in minuscule. Also, it would not escape us that, though in the days of Luther and Calvin resistance to the English and their obstinately impolitic claim of suzerainty still seemed the vital thread of Scottish national existence, inherited enmity was being enfeebled, partly by the multiplying perfidies of venal nobles and the increasing wealth of their paymasters, and partly also by the accumulating proofs that in the new age a Scotland which lived only to help France and hamper England would herself be a poor little Power among the nations: doomed, not only to occasional Floddens and Pinkies, but to continuous misery, anarchy, and obscurity.

All this deserves, and finds, full treatment at the hands of the historians of Scotland. They will also sufficiently warn us that the events of 1560 leave a great deal unchanged. Faith may be changed; works are much what they were, especially the works of the magnates. The blood-feud is no less a blood-feud because one family calls itself Catholic and another calls itself Protestant. The "band" is no less a "band" because it is styled a "Covenant" and makes free with holy names. A King shall be kidnapped, and a King shall be murdered, as of old·—it is the custom of the country. What is new is that farsighted men all Europe over, not only at London and at Paris, but at Rome and at Geneva, should take interest in these barbarous deeds, this customary turmoil.

Continuity there had been and to spare. In that mournful procession of the five Jameses there is no break (1406–1542). The last of them is engaged in the old task, and failing as his forbears failed. It is picturesque; sometimes it is heroic; often it is pathetic; but it is never modern. Modern history sees it as a funeral procession burying a dead time, and we are silent while it passes. In a few sentences we make our way towards the momentous years.

Scotland had been slow to emerge from the Middle Age. A country which of all others demanded strong and steady government had been plagued by a series of infant Kings and contested Regencies. In the sixteenth century its barons still belonged to the twelfth, despite a thin veneer of French manners. Its institutions were rudimentary; its Parliaments were feudal assemblies. Since the close of the War of Independence there had been hardly anything that could properly be called constitutional growth. Sometimes there was a little imitation of England and sometimes a little imitation of France, the King appearing as a more or less radical reformer. But the King died young, leaving an infant son, and his feudatories had no desire for reformation. The

Scottish monarchy, if monarchy it may be called, was indeed strictly limited; but the limits were set much rather by the power of certain noble families and their numerous retainers than by an assembly of Estates expressing the constant will of an organised community. The prelates, lords, and represented boroughs formed but one Chamber. Attempts to induce the lesser tenants-in-chief to choose representatives who would resemble the English knights of the shire had been abortive, and a bad habit prevailed of delegating the work of a Parliament to a committee known as "the Lords of the Articles." Normally the assembly of Estates was but the registrar of foregone conclusions. In troublous times (and the times were often troublous) the faction that was in power would hold a Parliament, and the other faction would prudently abstain from attendance. When in 1560 an unusually full, free and important Parliament was held for the reformation of religion, an elementary question concerning the right of the minor barons to sit and vote was still debateable, and for many years afterwards those who desire to see the true contribution of Scotland to the history of representative institutions will look, not to the blighted and stunted conclave of the three Estates with its titular Bishops and Abbots commendatory, but to the fresh and vigorous Assembly of the Presbyterian Church.

Steady taxation and all that it implies had been out of the question. The Scots were ready to fight for their King, unless they happened to be fighting against him; but they would not provide him with a revenue adequate for the maintenance of public order. He was expected "to live of his own" in medieval fashion, and his own was not enough to raise him high above his barons. Moreover, Douglases and Hamiltons and others, hereditary sheriffs and possessors of "regalities," were slow to forget that these crowned stewards of Scotland were no better than themselves. What had "come with a lass" might "go with a lass," and was in no wise mysterious We shall see Queen Mary, widow of a King of France, giving her hand first to a Lennox-Stewart whose mother is a Douglas and then to a Hepburn, while the heir presumptive to the throne is the head of the Hamiltons We shall see Queen Elizabeth having trouble with northern earls, with Percies and Nevilles, who set up an altar which she had cast down, and belike would have cast down an altar which she had set up; but their power to disturb England was as nothing to the power of disturbing Scotland which was exercised by those near neighbours and like-minded fellows of theirs who joined the bellicose Congregation of Jesus Christ. And even in the briefest sketch we must not omit to notice that, as beyond England lay Scotland, so beyond the historic Scotland lay the unhistoric land of "the savages." The very means that had been taken by Scottish Kings to make Scotsmen of these "red-shanks" and to bring these savages within the pale of history had raised up new feudatories of almost royal rank and of more than baronial turbulence. Thenceforward, the King would

have to reckon, not only with an Albany, an Angus, and an Arran, but also with an Argyll and with a Huntly. When we see these things we think of the dark age: of Charles the Simple and Rolf the Pirate.

Neither valorous feats of arms which overtaxed a people's strength nor a superabundance of earls and barons should conceal from us the nakedness of the land. It is more than probable that in the middle of the sixteenth century the whole of the Scottish nation, including untamable Highlanders, was not too large to be commodiously housed in the Glasgow of to-day. Life was short, and death was violent. It is true that many hopeful signs of increasing prosperity and enlightenment are visible in the days of James IV (1488–1513). But those days ended at Flodden. The flowers of the forest were once more mown down. The hand went back upon the dial towards poverty and barbarity. An aptitude for letters we may see. Of a brief springtime of song Scotland may fairly boast, for as yet no icy wind was blowing from Geneva. Universities we may see: more universities indeed than the country could well support. By a memorable, if futile, Act of Parliament James IV attempted to drive the sons of the gentry into the grammar-schools. But an all-pervading lack of wealth and of the habits that make for wealth was an impediment to every good endeavour. The printing press had been in no hurry to reach England (1477); but thirty years more elapsed before it entered Scotland. An aptitude for jurisprudence we might infer from subsequent history; but it is matter of inference. Of lawyers who were not ecclesiastics, of temporal lawyers comparable to the professionally learned justices and serjeants of England, we can hardly read a word. When at length James V founded the College of Justice (1532), half the seats in it, and indeed one more, were allotted to the clergy, and in later days foreign science was imported from the continental universities to supply the deficiencies of an undeveloped system. Scotland had been no place for lawyers, and the temporal law that might be had there, though it came of an excellent stock, had for the more part been of the bookless kind. And as with jurisprudence, so with statesmanship. The Scottish statesman who was not a Bishop was a man of a new kind when Lethington began his correspondence with Cecil; for, even if we employ a medieval standard, we can hardly attribute statecraft or policy to the Albanys and Anguses and Arrans.

In this poor and sparsely peopled country the Church was wealthy; the clergy were numerous, laic, and lazy. The names of "dumb dogs" and "idle bellies" which the new preachers fixed upon them had not been unearned. Nowhere else was there a seed-plot better prepared for revolutionary ideas of a religious sort. Nowhere else would an intelligible Bible be a newer book, or a sermon kindle stranger fires. Nowhere else would the pious champions of the Catholic faith be

ompelled to say so much that was evil of those who should have been heir pastors. Abuses which had been superficial and sporadic in England were widely spread and deeply rooted in the northern kingdom. In particular, the commendation of ecclesiastical benefices to laymen, o babies, had become a matter of course. The Lord James Stewart, the King's base-born son, who at the critical moment is Prior of St Andrews and sits in Parliament as a member of the spiritual Estate, s a typical figure. The corslet had "clattered" beneath the Archbishop's cassock, and when Bishops and Abbots lie among the dead on Flodden field they have done no less but no more than their duty. We ay that the Scottish Church was rich, and so it nominally was, for the irk-lands were broad; but when the Protestant ministers, much to their wn disappointment, had to be content with a very small fraction of the ld ecclesiastical revenues, they had probably secured a larger share than ad for a long time past been devoted to any purpose more spiritual han the sustentation of royal, episcopal, and baronial families. We xclaim against the greedy nobles whose lust for the kirk-lands is one of he operative forces in the history of the Scottish Reformation. They night have said that they were only rearranging on a reasonable and nodern basis what had long been for practical purposes the property of heir class. Their doings send back our thoughts to far-off Carolingian lays, when the "benefice" became the hereditary fief. To the King it as, no doubt, convenient that the power of those nobles who would ave heirs should be balanced by the power of other nobles, called relates, whose children would not be legitimate. But such a system ould not be stable, and might at any time provoke an overwhelming utcry for its destruction, if ever one bold man raised his voice against t. Men who are not themselves very moral can feel genuine indignation hen they detect immorality among those who, though no worse than hemselves, pretend to superior holiness. Prelates, and even primates f Scotland, who were bastards and the begetters of bastards, were the rincipal fore-runners and coadjutors of John Knox; and unfortunately hey were debarred by professional rules from pleading that they, or the est among them, were in truth the respectable husbands of virtuous ives.

Lollardy too there had been, and in some corners of the land it had ever been thoroughly extirpated. Also there had been a little burning, ut far from enough to accustom the Scots to the sight of a heretic ortured by the flames. Then the German leaven began to work, and rom 1528 onwards a few Lutherans were burnt. The protomartyr was atrick Hamilton, the young and well born Abbot of Ferne. Like many nother Scottish youth he had been at the University of Paris. Afterards he had made a pilgrimage, if not to Wittenberg, at all events to Marburg. It is characteristic of time and place that historians have to onsider whether a feud between Douglases and Hamiltons counts for

nothing in his martyrdom. "The reek of Patrick Hamilton," we are told, infected many; and we can well believe it. The College of St Leonard was tainted with humanism and new theology. Young men fled from Scotland and made fame elsewhere. Such were Alexander Aless, who as Alesius became the friend of Melanchthon, and John Macalpine, who as Machabaeus professed divinity at Copenhagen. Such also was George Buchanan, the humanist and the Calvinist, the tutor and the calumniator of Queen Mary. And we see the Wedderburns who are teaching Scotsmen to sing ballads of a novel kind, "good and godly ballads," but such as priests are loth to hear. And we see Sir David Lindsay, the herald, the poet, the King's friend, scourging the lives and sometimes the beliefs of the clergy with verses which rich and poor will know by heart. In short, there was combustible material lying about in large quantities, and sparks were flying.

But the day of revolt was long delayed. What held in check the rebellious and even the Reforming forces, was the best of Scottish traditions, the undying distrust of an England which claimed an overlordship; and in the days of Henry VIII no wholesomer tradition could there be. His father had schemed for amity by way of matrimonial alliance, and Margaret Tudor had become the wife and mother of Scottish Kings. It was plain that in the age of great monarchies England would be feeble so long as she had a hostile Scotland behind her. But the Tudor would not see that he could not annex Scotland, or that a merely annexed Scotland would still be the old enemy. Just as in the days of the Great Schism England had acknowledged one, and Scotland the other, of the rival Popes, so in the new days of a greater schism James V became the better Catholic because his bullying uncle had broken with Rome. As was natural for a King of Scots, he leant upon the support of the clergy, and thereby he offended his barons. They failed him in his hour of need. After the shameful rout at Solway Moss, he turned his face to the wall and died, a worn-out desperate man at the age of thirty years (December 14, 1542).

His wife, Mary of Lorraine, the sister of those Guises who were to be all-powerful in France, had just borne him a daughter: she was the ill-fated Mary Stewart (December 8, 1542). Once more, a baby was to be crowned in Scotland. Next to her in hereditary succession stood a remote cousin, the head of the House of Hamilton, James Earl of Arran, the Châtelherault of after times. But his right depended on the validity of a divorce which some might call in question; and Matthew Stewart, Earl of Lennox, had pretensions. At the head of the Scottish clergy stood the able, though dissolute, Archbishop of St Andrews, Cardinal David Beton. For a moment it seemed as if a Reformed religion, or some northern version of Henricanism, was to have its chance. The nobles chose Arran for Regent; many of them envied the clergy; many were in Henry's pay. Arran for a while inclined towards England; he kept

heretical chaplains; a Parliament, in spite of clerical protest, declared that the Bible might be read in the vulgar tongue. Beton had been imprisoned; a charge of falsifying the late King's will had been brought against him. Henry's opportunity had come: the little Queen was to be wedded to Edward Tudor. But Henry was the worst of unionists. He bribed, but he also blustered, and let all men see that Scotland must be his by foul means if not by fair. A treaty was signed (July 1, 1543); but within six months (December 11) it was repudiated by the Scots. Meanwhile the feeble Arran, under pressure of an interdict, had reconciled himself with Beton and had abjured his heresies. The old league with France was re-established. Henry then sent fleet and army. Edinburgh was burnt (May, 1544). The Lowlands were ravaged with pitiless ferocity. The Scottish resistance was feeble. There were many traitors. The powerful Douglases played a double part. Lennox was for the English, and was rewarded with the hand of Henry's niece, Margaret Douglas. But Scotland could not be annexed, the precious child could not be captured, and Henry could not yet procure the murder of the Cardinal.

Patriotism and Catholicism were now all one. Not but that there were Protestants. One George Wishart, who had been in Switzerland and at Cambridge, was preaching the Gospel, and some (but this is no better than a guess) would identify him with a Wishart who was plotting Beton's murder. He had powerful protectors, and among his disciples was a man of middle age, born in 1505, who as yet had done nothing memorable; he was priest, notary, private tutor; his name was John Knox. Wishart was arrested, tried and burnt for heresy (March 2, 1546). Thereupon a band of assassins burst into the castle of St Andrews and slew Beton (May 29, 1546). The leaders were well born men, Leslies, Kirkaldys, Melvilles. Their motives were various. Ancient feuds and hopes of English gold were mingled with hatred for a "bloody butcher of the saints of God." They held the castle and the town. The ruffianly and the godly flocked in. There was a strange mixture of debauchery and gospel in the St Andrews of those days. John Knox appeared there and was "called" to preach to the congregation; reluctantly (so he says) he accepted the call. The Regent had laid siege, but had failed. At length came French ships with requisite artillery. The besieged capitulated (July, 1547); they were to be taken to France and there liberated. John Knox was shipped off with the rest, and was kept in the galleys for nineteen months, to meditate on faith that justifies.

Meanwhile Henry of England had died (January 28, 1547); but the Protector Somerset was bent on marrying his boy King to the girl Queen. He had excellent projects in his head. He could speak of a time when England and Scotland would be absorbed and forgotten in Great Britain; but the French also were busy around Mary Stewart. So he led an army northwards, and fought the battle of Pinkie (September 10,

1547). No more decisive defeat could have been inflicted on the Scottis host and the Britannic idea. Other events called Somerset home. Th Scots could always be crushed in the field, but Scotland could not b annexed. Then came help from the good friend France, in the shap of French, German, and Italian troops; the English employed German and Spaniards. A Parliament decided to accept a French proposa (July, 1548): the Queen of Scots should marry, not the English King but young Francis the Dauphin, and meantime should be placed ou of harm's way. She was shipped off at Dumbarton, and landed i Britanny (August 13, 1548) to pass a happy girlhood in a lettered an luxurious Court. The war was prosecuted with a bloodthirst new in th savage annals of the borders; it was a war fought by mercenary Almain When peace was signed in 1550, England had gained nothing, and upo the surface (though only upon the surface) Scotland was as Catholic a ever it had been, grateful to France, bitterly resentful against heretica England.

During the struggle Mary of Lorraine had borne herself bravely; sh appeared as the guiding spirit of a national resistance. She or he advising kinsfolk were soon to make, though in less brutal sort, th mistake that Henry VIII had made, and this time it was to be irre trievable. During a visit to France (September, 1550—October, 1551 she schemed with her brothers and the French King. She was to tak Arran's place as Regent; he had been compensated with the duch (no empty title) of Châtelherault, and his eldest son (who now become the Arran of our story) was to command the French King's Scots guar The arrangement was not perfected until 1554, for "the second perso in the kingdom" was loth to relax his hold on a land of which he migh soon be King; but the French influence was strong, and he yielde Mary of Lorraine was no bad ruler for Scotland; but still the Sco could not help seeing that she was ruling in the interest of a foreig Power. Moreover, there had been a change in the religious environmen Mary Tudor had become Queen of England (July 6, 1553). Joh Knox, who after his sojourn in the French galleys had been one King Edward's select preachers and had narrowly escaped the bishopr of Rochester, was fleeing to Geneva; and thence he went to Frankfor there to quarrel with his fellow exile Dr Cox over the Book of Commo Prayer. In Scotland Catholicism had been closely allied with patriotism but when England became Catholic, Protestant preachers found refug in Scotland. The King of France was cherishing the intrigues English heretics against the Spanish Queen; Mary of Lorraine was n fanatic, and her policy was incompatible with stern repression. She wa trying to make Scotland more securely French; the task was delicate and she needed the support of nobles who had little love for the clerg A few high offices were given to Frenchmen; a few French soldiers wer kept in the fortresses; they were few, but enough to scatter whole hos

of undrilled Scots. An attempt to impose a tax for the support of troops was resisted, and the barons showed a strange reluctance to fight the English. At length the time came for the Queen's marriage (April 24, 1558). The Scottish statesmen had laboriously drawn a treaty which should guard the independence of their realm and the rights of the House of Hamilton. This was signed; but a few days earlier Mary Stewart had set her hand to other documents which purported to convey Scotland for good and all to the King of France. We may find excuses for the girl; but, if treason can be committed by a sovereign, she was a traitor. She had treated Scotland as a chattel. The act was secret; but the Scots guessed much and were uneasy.

In the meantime Calvinism, for it was Calvinism now, was spreading. After the quarrels at Frankfort, Knox had gone back to Geneva and had sat at the master's feet. In 1555 he returned to Scotland, no mere preacher, but an organiser also. He went through the country, and "Churches" of the new order sprang into being where he went. Powerful nobles began to listen, such as Lord Lorne, who was soon to be Earl of Argyll, and the Queen's bastard brother, the Lord James Stewart, who was to be Earl of Moray and Regent. And politicians listened also, such as William Maitland, the young laird of Lethington. Knox was summoned before an ecclesiastical Court (May 15, 1556); but apparently at the last moment the hearts of the clergy failed them, and the prosecution was abandoned. It was evident that he had powerful supporters, especially the Earl of Glencairn. Moreover the natural leader of the clergy, John Hamilton, the Primate of Scotland, was a bastard brother of Châtelherault and, as a Hamilton, looked with suspicion on the French policy of Mary of Lorraine, so that the chiefs of Church and State were not united. However, Knox had no mind for martyrdom; and so, after sending to the Regent an admonitory letter, which she cast aside with scornful words, he again departed for Geneva (July, 1556). Then the Bishops summoned him once more; but only his effigy could be burnt.

The preaching went on. In the last days of 1557 the first "Covenant" was signed. "The Congregation of Jesus Christ," of which Argyll, Glencairn, and other great men were members, stood out in undisguised hostility to that "congregation of Satan" which styled itself the Catholic Church. They demanded that King Edward's Prayer Book (which was good enough for them if not for their absent inspirer) should be read in all the churches. The Regent was perplexed; the French marriage had not yet been secured; but she did not prevent the prelates from burning one Walter Milne, who was over eighty years of age (April, 1558). He was the last of the Protestant martyrs; they had not been numerous, even when judged by the modest English standard; fanaticism was not among the many faults of the Scottish prelates; but for this reason his cruel death made the deeper mark. On St Giles' day (September 1) in 1558 that Saint's statue was being carried through

the town of Edinburgh, of which he was the patron. Under the eyes of the Regent the priests were rabbled and the idol was smashed in pieces. It was plain that the next year would be stormy; and at this crisis the face of England was once more changed.

A few weeks later Henry Percy, brother of the Earl of Northumberland, was talking with the Duke of Châtelherault. God, said the Englishman, has sent you a true and Christian religion. We are on the point of receiving the same boon. Why should you and we be enemies—we who are hardly out of our servitude to Spain; you who are being brought into servitude by France? The liberties of Scotland are in jeopardy and the rights of the Hamiltons. Might we not unite in the maintenance of God's Word and national independence? This is the ideal which springs to light in the last months of 1558:—deliverance from the toils of foreign potentates; amity between two sister nations; union in a pure religion. The Duke himself was a waverer; his duchy lay in France; he is the Antoine de Bourbon of Scottish history; but his son the Earl of Arran had lately installed a Protestant preacher at Châtelherault and was in correspondence with Calvin. Percy reported this interview to an English lady who had once been offered to the Duke as a bride for Arran and had just become Queen Elizabeth.

Mary, Queen of England and Spain, died on the 17th of November, 1558. The young woman at Hatfield, who knew that her sister's days were numbered, had made the great choice. Ever since May it had been clear that she would soon be Queen. The Catholics doubted and feared, but had no other candidate; King Philip was hopeful. So Elizabeth was prepared. William Cecil was to be her secretary, and England was to be Protestant. Her choice may surprise us. When a few months later she is told by the Bishop of Aquila that she has been imprudent, he seems for once to be telling the truth.

Had there been no religious dissension, her title to the throne would hardly have been contested among Englishmen. To say nothing of her father's will, she had an unrepealed statute in her favour. Divines and lawyers might indeed have found it difficult to maintain her legitimate birth. Parliament had lately declared that her father was lawfully married to Catharine of Aragon, and with this good Catholics would agree. But there was another scandal, of which good Protestants might take account. Elizabeth's godfather, the Henrican Archbishop and Protestant martyr, had adjudged that Henry was never married to Anne Boleyn. His reasons died with him; but something bad, something nameless, might be guessed. It is sometimes said that Elizabeth's birth condemned her to be Protestant or bastard. But it would be truer to say that, had she cared much about legitimacy, she would have made her peace with Rome. Hints came to her thence, that the plenitude of power can set these little matters straight for the benefit of well

disposed princes; and in papal eyes Cranmer's sentence would have been a prejudice in her favour. But pure legitimism, the legitimism of the divine entail, was yet in its infancy, and neither Protestant nor Catholic was bound to deny that a statute of the realm may set a bastard on the throne of William the Conqueror. For the people at large it would be enough that the Lady Elizabeth was the only living descendant of old King Henry, and that beyond her lay civil war. The thin stream of Tudor blood was running dry. Henry's will (but its validity might be questioned) had postponed the issue of his elder to that of his younger sister: in other words, the House of Scotland to the House of Suffolk. Mary Stewart was born in Scotland; she could not have inherited an acre of English land, and it was highly doubtful whether English law would give the crown to an alien who was the child of two aliens. Neither her grandmother's second marriage, namely that with Archibald Douglas (whence sprang Lady Lennox and her son Lord Darnley), nor the marriage of Mary Tudor with Charles Brandon (whence sprang Greys and Stanleys) was beyond reproach;—few marriages were beyond reproach in those days of loose morals and conniving law. John Knox at Geneva had, to Calvin's regret, just blown a first blast of the trumpet against the monstrous regiment of women, and unfortunately, though the tone was new, the tune was not. The Scottish gospeller could only repeat the biblical and other arguments that had been used a century ago by that Lancastrian sage, Chief Justice Fortescue. No woman had sat upon the English throne, save Mary, and she (it might be said) was a statutory Queen. Many people thought that next in right to Elizabeth stood Henry Hastings, who was no Tudor but a Yorkist; and already in 1565 Philip of Spain was thinking of his own descent from Edward III. Thus Elizabeth's statutory title stood between England and wars of the roses which would also be wars of religion.

At this moment, however, she put a difference of creed between herself and the Dauphiness. It may be that in any case Henry II of France, who was in want of arguments for the retention of Calais, would have disputed Elizabeth's legitimacy; it was said that he had been prepared to dispute the legitimacy of her Catholic sister. But had Elizabeth been Catholic, the French and Scottish claim to her throne would have merely been an enemy's insult: an insult to England, a challenge to Spain. As it was, Henry might lay a strong case before the Pope and the Catholic world: Elizabeth was bastard and heretic to boot, and at this moment Paul IV was questioning Ferdinand's election to the Empire because some of his Electors were Lutherans. That heretics are not to rule was no new principle; the Counts of Toulouse had felt its edge in the old Albigensian days.

After the fall of Calais in January (1558) England was panic-stricken. The French were coming; the Scots were coming; Danes and Hanseats were coming. German troops were being hastily hired to protect

Northumberland. Philip's envoy, the Count of Feria, saw incompetence everywhere. The nobles held aloof, while some aged clergymen tried to conduct a war. He hardly dared to think what would happen if a few French ships touched the shore. Since then, there had been some improvement. No invader had landed, and Guise's capture of Thionville had been balanced by Egmont's victory at Gravelines. Shortly before Mary's death negotiations for a peace were begun at Cercamp; the outline of the scheme was a restoration of conquests. But Calais stopped the way. The French could not surrender that prize, and they were the more constant in their determination because the King of Spain would not much longer be King of England, and an isolated England would have no conquest to restore. When Elizabeth became Queen, Calais was not yet lost; that was the worst of it. Both Kings were weary of the war; behind both yawned gulfs of debt and heresy. But the ruler of the Netherlands was deeply concerned in the recovery of Calais—perhaps more materially, though less sentimentally, than were the English. Feria has reported the profound remark that when Calais was captured many Englishmen ceased to go to church. A Protestant Elizabeth might have to sign away the last memorial of old glories; and that would not fill the churches. Philip, it might be plain, would not suffer the French to invade England through Scotland; but the tie between Spain and an heretical England would be the coolest selfishness, the King's mind would be distracted between his faith and his policy, and if he were compelled to save England from the French, he certainly would not save England for the English.

True that for Protestant eyes there was light on the horizon. Anyone could see that there would be religious troubles in France and Scotland. Geneva was active, and Rome seemed to be doting. That summer the psalms had gone up loudly from the Pré-aux-Clercs, and a Châtillon had been arrested. That autumn St Giles of Edinburgh had lain prostrate in the mud. Expectant heirs and royal cadets, Bourbons and Hamiltons, were wavering; Maximilian was listening to an enlightened pastor; France, Scotland, the Empire, might some day fall to evangelical lords. Good news came from Poland, Bohemia, and Hungary; it was even rumoured that the Pope would at last succeed in shaking Philip's faith. Still, the black fact of the moment was that Philip and Henry were making peace in order that they might crush their respective heretics. And England's military weakness was patent to all. Her soldiers and captains were disgracefully old-fashioned, and what gunpowder she had was imported from the Netherlands. "To make a lewd comparison," said an Englishman, "England is as a bone thrown between two dogs." Was this bone to display an irritating activity of its own, merely because the two dogs seemed for the moment to be equal and opposite? To more than one mind came the same thought: "They will make a Piedmont of England."

Within the country the prospect was dubious. The people were discontented: defeat and shame, pestilence and famine had lately been their lot. A new experiment would be welcome; but it would miserably fail were it not speedily successful. No doubt, the fires in Smithfield had harmed the Catholic cause by confirming the faith and exasperating the passions of the Protestants. No doubt, the Spanish marriage was detested. But we may overestimate the dislike of persecution and the dislike of Spain. No considerable body of Englishmen would deny that obstinate heretics should be burnt. There was no need for Elizabeth to marry Philip or bring Spaniards into the land; but the Spanish alliance, the old Anglo-Burgundian alliance, was highly valued: it meant safety and trade and occasional victories over the hereditary foe. Moreover, the English Reformers were without a chief; beyond Elizabeth they had no pretender to the throne; they had no apostle, no prophet; they were scattered over Europe and had been quarrelling, Knoxians against Coxians, in their foreign abodes. Edward's reign had worn the gloss off the new theology. We may indeed be sure that, had Elizabeth adhered to the old faith, she must have quelled plots and rebellions or herself been quelled. We look at Scotland, France, and the Netherlands, and, it may be, infer that the storm would have overwhelmed her. Perhaps we forget how largely the tempests that we see elsewhere were due to the momentous choice that she made for England. It must probably be allowed that most of the young men of brains and energy who grew to manhood under Mary were lapsing from Catholicism, and that the educated women were falling faster and further. London too, Bonner's London, was Protestant, and London might be worth an abolished Mass. But when, after some years of fortunate and dexterous government, we see how strong is the old creed, how dangerous is Mary Stewart as its champion, we cannot feel sure that Elizabeth chose the path which was, or which seemed to be, the safest.

Of her own opinions she told strange tales. Puzzled by her shifty discourse, a Spanish envoy once suggested atheism. When a legal settlement had been made, it was her pleasure, and perhaps her duty, to explain that her religion was that of all sensible people. The difference between the various versions of Christianity "*n'estoit que bagatelle.*" So she agreed with the Pope, except about some details; she cherished the Augsburg confession, or something very like it; she was at one, or nearly at one, with the Huguenots. She may have promised her sister (but this is not proved) to make no change in religion; at any rate she had gone to mass without much ado. Nevertheless it is not unlikely that at the critical time her conduct was swayed rather by her religious beliefs or disbeliefs than by any close calculation of loss and gain. She had not her father's taste for theology; she was neither prig like her brother nor zealot like her sister; but she had been taught from the first to contemn the Pope, and during Edward's reign she had been highly educated in

the newest doctrines. John Hooper, the father of the Puritans, had admired her displays of argumentative divinity. More than one Catholic who spoke with her in later days was struck by her ignorance of Catholic verity. The Bishop of Aquila traced her phrases to "the heretic Italian friars." He seems to have been thinking of Vermigli and Ochino, and there may have been some little truth in his guess. Once she said that she liked Italian ways and manners better than any other, and sometimes seemed to herself half Italian. Her eyes filled with tears over Peter Martyr's congratulations. She had talked predestination with Fra Bernardino and had translated one of his sermons; the Puritans were persuaded that if she would listen to no one else, she would listen to him. All this might have meant little; but then she had suffered in the good cause. She had been bullied into going to mass; she had been imprisoned; she had nearly been excluded from the throne; some ardent Catholics had sought her life; and her suspected heresies had been at least a part of her offending. It would have been base to disappoint all those who had prayed for her and plotted for her, and pleasant it was when from many lands came letters which hailed her as the miraculously preserved champion of the truth. She had a text ready for the bearer of the good news: "This is the Lord's doing and it is marvellous in our eyes."

One point was clear. The Henrican Anglo-Catholicism was dead and buried. It died with Henry and was interred by Stephen Gardiner. In distant days its spirit might arise from the tomb; but not yet. The Count of Feria and Bishop Tunstall were at needless pains to explain to the young Queen that she was favouring "Lutherans and Zwinglians," whom her father would have burnt. But in 1558 nothing was to be gained by mere schism. Her fellow sovereigns, more especially her brother-in-law, could have taught her that a prince might enjoy all the advantages of spotless orthodoxy and yet keep the Pope at arm's length. Many Englishmen hated "popery,"; but by this time the core of the popery that they hated was no longer the Papacy, but the idolatrous Mass. The choice lay between Catholicism with its Pope and the creed for which Cranmer and Ridley died. It could scarcely be hoped that the Bishops would yield an inch. Very shame, if no worthier motive, would keep them true to the newly restored supremacy of Rome. Happily for Elizabeth, they were few and feeble. Reginald Pole had hardly outlived Mary, and for one reason or another had made no haste in filling vacant sees;—Feria thought that the "accursed Cardinal" had French designs. And death had been and still was busy. Only sixteen instead of twenty-six Bishops were entitled to attend the critical Parliament, and only eleven with the Abbot of Westminster were present. Their constancy in the day of trial makes them respectable; but not one of them was a leader of men. The ablest of them had been Henry's ministers and therefore could be taunted as renegades.

A story which came from a good quarter bade us see Elizabeth announcing to the Pope her accession to the throne, and not rejecting Catholicism until Paul IV declared that England was a papal fief and she an usurping bastard. Now, Caraffa was capable of any imprudence and just at this moment seemed bent on reviving the claims of medieval Pontiffs, in order that he might drive a long-suffering Emperor into the arms of the Lutherans. But it is certain now that in the matter of courtesy Elizabeth, not Paul, was the offender. She ignored his existence. Edward Carne was living at Rome as Mary's ambassador. He received no letters of credence from the new Queen, and on the 1st of February, 1559, she told him to come home as she had nothing for him to do. Meanwhile the French were thinking to obtain a Bull against her; they hoped that at all events Paul would not allow her to marry her dead sister's husband. At Christmastide (1558), when she was making a scene in her chapel over the elevation of the Host, the Pope was talking kindly of her to the French ambassador, would not promise to refuse a dispensation, but could not believe that another Englishwoman would want to marry a detestable Spaniard. A little later he knew more about her and detained Carne (a not unwilling prisoner) at Rome (March 27), not because she was base-born, but because she had revolted from the Holy See. He had just taken occasion to declare in a Bull that princes guilty of heresy are deprived of all lawful power by the mere fact of their guilt (February 15). This edict, though it may have been mainly aimed at Ferdinand's three Protestant Electors, was a salutary warning for Elizabeth and Anthony and Maximilian; but no names were named. Philip had influence enough to balk the French intrigue and protect his sister-in-law from a direct anathema. The Spaniard may in Paul's eyes have been somewhat worse than a heretic; but the quarrel with the other Habsburg, and then the sudden attack upon his own scandalous nephews, were enough to consume the few remaining days of the fierce old man. He has much to answer for; but it was no insult from him that made Elizabeth a Protestant.

No time was lost. Mary's death (November 17, 1558) dissolved a Parliament. Heath, Archbishop of York and Chancellor of the realm, dismissed it, and with loyal words proclaimed the new Queen. Within three weeks (December 5) writs went out for a new Parliament. Elizabeth was going to exact conformity to a statutory religion. For the moment the statutory religion was the Roman Catholic, and she would have taken a false step if in the name of some higher law she had annulled or ignored the Marian statutes. At once she forbade innovations and thus disappointed the French who hoped for a turbulent revolution. A new and happy *et caetera* was introduced into the royal style and seemed to hint, without naming, a Headship of the Church. Every change pointed one way. Some of the old Councillors were retained, but the new Councillors were Protestants. William Cecil, then

aged thirty-eight, had been Somerset's and was to be Elizabeth's secretary. Like her he had gone to mass, but no Catholic doubted that he was a sad heretic. The Great Seal, resigned by Heath, was given to Nicholas Bacon. He and Cecil had married sisters who were godly ladies of the new sort. The imprisoned heretics were bailed, and the refugees flocked back from Frankfort, Zurich and Geneva. Hardly was Mary dead, before one Bishop was arrested for an inopportune sermon (November 27). Another preached at her funeral (December 13) and praised her for rejecting that title which Elizabeth had not yet assumed: he too was put under restraint. Mary's chief mourner was not her sister, but, appropriately enough, the Lady Lennox who was to have supplanted Elizabeth. No Bishop preached the funeral sermon for Charles V, and what good could be said of that Catholic Caesar was said by the Protestant Dr Bill (December 24). The new Queen was artist to the finger-tips. The English Bible was rapturously kissed; the Tower could not be re-entered without uplifted eyes and thankful words; her hand (it was a pretty hand) shrank, so folk said, from Bonner's lips. Christmas-day was chosen for a more decisive scene. The Bishop who was to say mass in her presence was told not to elevate the Host. He would not obey; so after the Gospel out went Elizabeth; she could no longer witness that idolatry. Three weeks later (January 15) she was crowned while Calvin was dedicating to her his comments on Isaiah. What happened at the coronation is obscure. The Bishops, it seems, swore fealty in the accustomed manner; the Epistle and Gospel were read in English; it is said that the celebrant was one of the Queen's chaplains and that he did not elevate the Host; it is said that she did not communicate: she was anointed by the Bishop of Carlisle, whose rank would not have entitled him to this office, had not others refused it. At length the day came for a Parliament (January 25). A mass was said at Westminster early in the morning. At a later hour the Queen approached the Abbey with her choir singing in English. The last of the Abbots came to meet her with monks and candles. "Away with those torches" she exclaimed: "we can see well enough!" And then Edward's tutor, Dr Cox, late of Frankfort, preached; and he preached, it is said, for an hour and a half, the peers all standing.

The negotiations between Spain, England and France had been brought to a pause by Mary's death, but were to be resumed after a brief interval, during which Elizabeth was to make up her mind. Some outwardly amicable letters passed between her and Henry II. She tried to play the part of the pure-bred Englishwoman, who should not suffer for the sins of the Spanish Mary. But the French were not to be coaxed out of Calais, and she knew that they were seeking a papal Bull against her. It became plain that she must not detach herself from Spain and that, even with Philip's help, Calais could only be obtained after another war, for which England was shamefully unready. Then, in the middle of

January, came through Feria the expected offer of Philip's hand. Elizabeth seemed to hesitate, had doubts about the Pope's dispensing power and so forth; but in the end said that she did not mean to marry, and added that she was a heretic. Philip, it seems, was relieved by the refusal; he had laboriously explained to his ambassador that his proposal was a sacrifice laid upon the altar of the Catholic faith. He had hopes, which were encouraged in England, that one of his Austrian cousins, Ferdinand or Charles, would succeed where he had failed, secure England for orthodoxy, and protect the Netherlands from the ill example that an heretical England would set.

Meanwhile the great Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis was in the making. Elizabeth tried to retain Philip's self-interested support; and she retained it. Without substantial aid from England, he would not fight for Calais; she would have to sign it away; but so earnest had he been in this matter that the French covenanted to restore the treasured town after eight years and further to pay half-a-million of crowns by way of penalty in case they broke their promise. No one supposed that they would keep it; still they had consented to make the retention of Calais a just cause for war, and Elizabeth could plausibly say that some remnants of honour had been saved. But the clouds collected once more. New differences broke out among the negotiators, who had half a world to regulate, and, before the intricate settlement could be completed, a marriage had been arranged between Philip and one of Henry's daughters. Elizabeth of France, not Elizabeth of England, was to be the bride. The conjunction was ominous for heretics.

From the first days of February to the first days of April the negotiations had been pending. Meanwhile in England little had been accomplished. It had become plain that the clergy in possession (but there was another and expectant clergy out of possession) would not yield. The Convocation of Canterbury met when Parliament met, and the Lower House declared for transubstantiation, the sacrifice of the Mass, and the Roman supremacy; also it idly protested that laymen were not to meddle with faith, worship, or discipline (February 17, 1559). The Bishops were staunch; the English Church by its constitutional organs refused to reform itself; the Reformation would be an unprecedented state-stroke. Probably the assembled Commons were willing to strike. The influence of the Crown had been used on the Protestant side; but Cecil had hardly gathered the reins in his hand and the government's control over the electoral machinery must have been unusually weak. Our statistics are imperfect, but the number of knights and burgesses who, having served in 1558, were again returned in 1559 was not abnormally small, and with the House of 1558 Mary had been well content. Also we may see at Westminster not a few men who soon afterwards are "hinderers of true religion" or at best only "faint professors"; but probably the nation at large was not unwilling that

Elizabeth should make her experiment. A few creations and restorations of peerages strengthened the Protestant element among the lords. The Earl of Bedford and Lord Clinton appeared as proxies for many absent peers, and, of all the lords, Bedford (Francis Russell) was the most decisively committed to radical reform. The Howards were for the Queen, their cousin; the young Duke of Norfolk, England's one duke, was at this time ardently Protestant, and in the next year was shocked at the sight of undestroyed altars.

Money was cheerfully voted. The Queen was asked to choose a husband, and professed her wish to die a maid. She may have meant what she said, but assuredly did not mean that it should be believed. A prudently phrased statute announced that she was "lawfully descended and come of the blood royal"; another declared her capable of inheriting from her divorced and attainted mother; the painful past was veiled in general words. There was little difficulty about a resumption of those tenths and first-fruits which Mary had abandoned. Round the question of ecclesiastical supremacy the battle raged, and it raged for two months and more (February 9 to April 29). Seemingly the Queen's ministers carried through the Lower House a bill which went the full Henrican length in its Caesaro-papalism and its severity. Upon pain of a traitor's death, everyone was to swear that Elizabeth was the Supreme Head of the Church of England. In the Upper House, to which the bill came on the 27th of February, the Bishops had to oppose a measure which would leave the lives of all open Romanists at the mercy of the government. Few though they were, the dozen prelates could still do much in a House where there were rarely more than thirty temporal lords, and probably Cecil had asked for more than he wanted. On the 18th of March the project had taken a far milder form; forfeiture of office and benefice was to be the punishment of those who would not swear. Against this more lenient measure only two temporal lords protested; but a Catholic says that other "good Christians" were feigning to be ill. The bill went back to the Commons; then back with amendments to the Lords, who read it thrice on the 22nd. Easter fell on the 26th, and it had been hoped that by that time Parliament would have finished its work. Very little had been done; doctrine and worship had hardly been touched. Apparently an attempt to change the services of the Church had been made, had met with resistance, and had been abandoned.

Elizabeth was in advance of the law and beckoned the nation forward. During that Lent the Court sermon had been the only sermon, the preacher Scory or Sandys, Grindal or Cox. A papist's excited fancy saw a congregation of five thousand and heard extravagant blasphemy. On Easter day the Queen received the Communion in both kinds; the news ran over Europe; Antoine de Bourbon on the same day had done the like at Pau; Mary of Lorraine had marked that festival for the return of all Scots to the Catholic worship. The colloquy

of Westminster follows. There was to be a trial by battle in the Abbey between chosen champions of the two faiths. Its outcome might make us suspect that a trap was laid by the Protestants. But it is by no means certain that the challenge came from their side, and the Spanish ambassador took some credit for arranging the combat. The colloquy of Westminster stands midway between that of Worms (1557) and that of Poissy (1561). The Catholics were wont to get the better in these feats of arms, because, so soon as Christ's presence in the Eucharist was mentioned, the Protestants fell a-fighting among themselves. Apparently on this occasion the rules of the debate were settled by Heath and Bacon. The Great Seal had passed from an amiable to an abler keeper. The men of the Old Learning were to defend the use of Latin in the services of the Church, to deny that a "particular Church" can change rites and ceremonies and to maintain the propitiatory sacrifice of the Mass. Their first two theses would bring them into conflict with national feeling; and at the third point they would be exposed to the united force of Lutherans and Helvetians, for the sacrifice, and not the presence, was to be debated. It was a less advantage for the Reformers that their adversaries were to speak first, for there was to be no extemporary argument but only a reading of written dissertations. In the choir of the abbey, before Council, Lords, Commons and multitude, the combatants took their places on Friday, the 31st of March. At once the Catholics began to except against the rules that they were required to observe. Dr Cole, however, maintained their first proposition and Dr Horne read the Protestant essay. The Reformers were well content with that day's work and the applause that followed. On Monday the second question was to be handled. Of what happened we have no impartial account; we do not know what had passed between Heath and Bacon, or whether the Catholic doctors were taken by surprise. Howbeit, they chose the worst course; they wrangled about procedure and refused to continue the debate. Apparently they were out of heart and leaderless. Two of the Bishops were forthwith imprisoned by the Council for intemperate words, and thus the Catholic party in the House of Lords was seriously weakened at a critical moment. Moreover, the inference that men do not break off a debate with preliminary objections when they are confident of success in the main issue, though it is not always just, is always natural.

The next day Parliament resumed its work. Meanwhile, Elizabeth had at length decided that she would not assume the Henrican title, though assuredly she had meant that it should be, as it had been, offered to her. Women should keep silence in the churches; so there was difficulty about a "dumb head." She had managed to get a little credit from Philip's envoy and a little from zealous Calvinists by saying that she would not be Head of the Church, and she could then tell appropriate persons that she scorned a style which the Pope had

polluted. So Cecil had to go to the Commons and explain that there must be a new bill and new oath. He met with some opposition, for there were who held that the Queen was Supreme Head *iure divino.* Ultimately a phrase was fashioned which declared that she was the only Supreme Governor of the realm as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as in temporal, and that no foreign prince or prelate had any ecclesiastical or spiritual authority within her dominions. However, among other statutes of Henry VIII, one was revived which proclaims that the King is Head of the Church, and that by the word of God all ecclesiastical jurisdiction flows from him. Catholics suspected that Elizabeth's husband would be head of the Church, if not head of his wife, and saw the old title concealed behind the new *et caetera.* Protestant lawyers said that she could take the title whenever she pleased. Sensible men saw that, having the substance, she could afford to waive the irritating name. On the 14th of April the bill was before the Lords There were renewed debates and more changes; and the famous Act of Supremacy was not finally secured until the 29th.

In the last days of an unusually long session a bill for the Uniformity of Religion went rapidly through both Houses (April 18–28). The services prescribed in a certain Book of Common Prayer, and none other, were to be lawful. The embryonic history of this measure is obscure. An informal committee of Protestant divines seems to have been appointed by the Queen to prepare a book. It has been thought that as the basis of their labours they took the Second Book of Edward VI, but desired a further simplification of ceremonies. On the other hand, there are some signs that Cecil and the Queen thought that the Second Book, which had hardly been introduced before it was abrogated, had already gone far enough or too far in the abolition of accustomed rites. All this, however, is very uncertain. Our guess may be that, when men were weary of the prolonged debate over the Supremacy and its continuance was becoming a national danger (for violent speeches had been made), the Queen's advisers took the short course of proposing the Book of 1552 with very few changes. At such a moment relief might be found in what could be called a mere act of restoration, and the Edwardian Book, however unfamiliar, was already ennobled by the blood of martyrs. There are signs of haste, or of divided counsels, for the new Book when it came from the press differed in some little, but not trivial, matters from that which Parliament had expressly sanctioned. The changes sanctioned by Parliament were few. An offensive phrase about the Bishop of Rome's "detestable enormities" was expunged, apparently by the House of Lords. An addition from older sources was made to the words that accompany the delivery of bread and wine to the communicant, whereby a charge of the purest Zwinglianism might be obviated. At the moment it was of importance to Elizabeth that she should assure the German Princes that her religion was

Augustan; for they feared, and not without cause, that it was Helvetian. A certain "black rubric" which had never formed part of the statutory book fell away; it would have offended Lutherans; we have reason to believe that it had been inserted in order to meet the scruples of John Knox. Of what was done in the matter of ornaments by the statute, by the rubrics of the Book and by "injunctions" that the Queen promptly issued, it would be impossible to speak fairly without a lengthy quotation of documents, the import of which became in the nineteenth century a theme of prolonged and inconclusive disputation. It must here suffice that there are few signs of any of the clergymen who accepted the Prayer Book either having worn or having desired to wear in the ordinary churches—there was at times a little more splendour in cathedrals—any ecclesiastical robe except the surplice. But, to return to Elizabeth's Parliament, we have it on fairly good authority that nine temporal lords, including the Treasurer (the Marquis of Winchester), and nine prelates (two Bishops were in gaol) voted against the bill, and that it was only carried by three votes. Unfortunately at an exciting moment there is a gap, perhaps a significant gap, in the official record, and we cease to know what lords were present in the house. But about thirty temporal peers had lately been in attendance, and so we may infer that some of them were inclined neither to alter the religion of England nor yet to oppose the Queen. On the 5th of May, the Bishops were fighting in vain for the renovated monasteries. On the 8th, Parliament was dissolved.

At a moment of strain and peril a wonderfully durable settlement had been made. There is cause for thinking that the Queen's advisers had been compelled to abandon considerable parts of a lengthy programme; but the great lines had been drawn and were permanent. For this reason they can hardly be described in words that are both just and few; but perhaps we may make a summary of those points which were the most important to the men of 1559. A radical change in doctrine, worship and discipline has been made by Queen and Parliament against the will of prelates and ecclesiastical Councils. The legislative power of the Convocations is once more subjected to royal control. The derivation of episcopal from royal jurisdiction has been once more asserted in the words of Henry VIII. Appeal from the Courts of the Church lies to royal delegates who may be laymen. What might fairly be called a plenitude of ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the corrective sort can be, and at once is, committed to delegates who constitute what is soon known as the Court of High Commission and strongly resembles the consistory of a German Prince. Obstinate heresy is still a capital crime; but practically the Bishops have little power of forcing heretics to stand a trial, and, unless Parliament and Convocation otherwise ordain, only the wilder sectaries will be in danger of burning. There is no "liberty of cult." The Prayer Book prescribes the only lawful form of

common worship. The clergyman who adopts any other, even in a private chapel, commits a crime; so does he who procures this aberration from conformity. Everyone must go to church on Sunday and bide prayer and preaching or forfeit twelve pence to the use of the poor. Much also can be done to ensure conformity by excommunication which has imprisonment behind it. The papal authority is abolished. Clergy and office-holders can be required to swear that it is naught; if they refuse the oath, they lose office and benefice. If anyone advisedly maintains that authority, he forfeits his goods; on a third conviction he is a traitor. The service book is not such as will satisfy all ardent Reformers; but their foreign fathers in the faith think it not intolerable, and the glad news goes out that the Mass is abolished. The word "Protestant," which is rapidly spreading from Germany, comes as a welcome name. In the view of an officially inspired apologist of the Elizabethan settlement, those who are not Papists are Protestants.

The requisite laws had been made, but whether they would take effect was very uncertain. The new oath was not tendered to the judges; and some of them were decided Romanists. Nor was the validity of the statutes unquestioned, for it was by no means so plain as it now is that an Act against which the spiritual Lords have voted in a body may still be an Act of the three Estates. Gradually in the summer and autumn the Bishops were called upon to swear; they refused and were deprived. It is not certain that the one weak brother, Kitchin of Llandaff, actually swore the oath, though he promised to exact it from others. Futile hopes seem to have been entertained that Tunstall and Heath would at least take part in the consecration of their Protestant successors. Such successors were nominated by the Queen; but to make Bishops of them was not easy. Apparently a government bill dealing with this matter had come to naught. Probably the Queen's advisers had intended to abolish the canonical election; they procured its abolition in Ireland on the ground that it was inconsistent with the Royal Supremacy; but for some cause or another the English Parliament had restored that grotesque Henrican device, the compulsory election of a royal nominee. By a personal interview Elizabeth secured the conversion of the dean of the two metropolitan churches, that pliant old diplomat Nicholas Wotton. When sees and benefices were rapidly falling vacant, his adhesion was of great importance if all was to be done in an orderly way.

But given the election, there must still be confirmation and consecration; statute required it. The cooperation of four "Bishops" would be necessary if Matthew Parker was to sit where Reginald Pole had sat. Four men in episcopal Orders might be found: for instance, William Barlow, of whose Protestant religion there could be no doubt, since Albert of Prussia had lately attested it; but these men would not be in possession of English sees. Moreover, it seems to have been doubted

whether the Edwardian Ordinal had been revived as part of the Edwardian Prayer Book. Cecil was puzzled, but equal to the occasion. In a document redolent of the papal chancery Elizabeth "supplied" all "defects," and at length on the 17th of December, in the chapel at Lambeth, Parker was consecrated with Edwardian rites by Barlow, Scory, Coverdale and Hodgkin. The story of a simpler ceremony at the Nag's Head tavern was not concocted until long afterwards; it should have for pendants a Protestant fable which told of a dramatic scene between Elizabeth and the Catholic prelates, and an Anglican fable which strove to suggest that the Prayer Book was sanctioned by a synod of Bishops and clergy. A large number of deans and canons followed the example set by the Bishops. Of their inferiors hardly more than two hundred, so it seems, were deprived for refusing the oath. The royal commissioners treated the hesitating priests with patient forbearance; and the meaning of the oath was minimised by an ably worded Proclamation. We may conjecture that many of those who swore expected another turn of the always turning wheel. However, Elizabeth succeeded in finding creditable occupants for the vacant dignities; of Parker and some of his suffragans more than this might be said. The new service was introduced without exciting disturbances; the altars and roods were pulled down, tables were purchased, and a coat of whitewash veiled the pictured saints from view. Among the laity there was much despondent indifference. Within a dozen years there had been four great changes in worship, and no good had come of it all. For some time afterwards there are many country gentlemen whom the Bishops describe as "indifferent in religion." Would the Queen's Church secure them and their children? That question could not be answered by one who looked only at England. From the first, Elizabeth and Cecil, who were entering into their long partnership, had looked abroad.

The month of May, 1559, which saw the ratification of the Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis, is a grand month in the annals of the heresy which was to be destroyed. A hideous act of faith at Valladolid may show us that Catholicism is safe in Spain; but the English Parliament ends its work, a French Reformed Church shapes itself in the synod of Paris, and Scotland bursts into flame. In 1558 we saw it glowing. Mary of Guise was temporising; she had not yet obtained the crown matrimonial for the Dauphin. In the winter Parliament she had her way, the crown was to be (but never was) carried to her son-in-law. His father had just ceased his intrigues with English Protestants, and was making peace in order that he might be busy among the Protestants of France. The Regent of Scotland was given to understand that the time for tolerance was past. In March, 1559, the Scottish prelates followed the example of their English brethren and uttered their *Non possumus*. They proposed to remedy many an indefensible abuse, but to new beliefs there could

no concession. The Queen-mother fixed Easter day for the return of men to the Catholic worship. The order was disregarded. On the :h of May the more notorious of the preachers were to answer at rling for their misdeeds. They collected at Perth, with Protestant ds around them. At this moment Elizabeth's best friend sprang o the arena. John Knox had been fuming at Dieppe. Elizabeth, aged at his ill-timed "blast," denied him a safe conduct. François rel, too, the French Reformer, implored Calvin to keep this fire-brand . of England lest all should be spoilt. But if Knox chose to revisit his ive land that was no affair of Elizabeth's, and he was predestinated win for Calvinism the most durable of its triumphs. He landed in tland on the 2nd of May and was at Perth by the 11th. Then re was a sermon; a stone was thrown; an image was broken, and the irches of St Johnston were wrecked. Before the end of the month re were two armed hosts in the field. There were more sermons, and ere Knox preached the idols fell and monks and nuns were turned adrift. ere were futile negotiations and disregarded truces. At the head of belligerent Congregation rode Glencairn, Argyll, and Lord James. âtelherault was still with the Regent; and she had a small force of ciplined Frenchmen. At the end of July a temporary truce was made Leith. The Congregation could bring a numerous host (of the dieval sort) into the field, but could not keep it there. However, as power of the French soldiers was displayed, the revolutionary vement became more and more national. The strife, if it was between tholic and Calvinist, was also a strife for the delivery of Scotland from a eign army. None the less there was a revolt. Thenceforth, Calvinism en appears as a rebellious religion. This, however, is its first appear-ce in that character. Calvin had long been a power in the world of formed theology, and his death (1564) was not far distant; but in 59 the Count of Feria was at pains to tell King Philip that "this lvin is a Frenchman and a great heretic" (March 19). Knox, when preached "the rascal multitude" into iconoclastic fury was setting an ample to *Gueux* and Huguenots. What would Elizabeth think of it?

Throughout the winter and spring Englishmen and Scots, who had n dragged into war by their foreign masters, had been meeting on border and talking first of armistice and then of peace. Already in uary Maitland of Lethington had a strong desire to speak with Sir illiam Cecil and since then had been twice in London. He was the gent's Secretary, conforming in religion as Cecil had conformed; but it ikely that the core of such creed as he had was unionism. The news it came from Scotland in May can hardly have surprised the English retary. "Some great consequences must needs follow": this was his iet comment (May 26). Diplomatic relations with France had just n resumed. Nicholas Throckmorton, one of those able men who begin collect around Elizabeth, had gone to reside there as her ambassador,

had gone to "practise" there and exacerbate the "garboils" there. One of the first bits of news that he sends home is that Arran has been summoned to Court from Poitou, where he has been Calvinising, has disobeyed the summons and cannot be found (May 30). The Guises connect Arran's disappearance with Throckmorton's advent; and who shall say that they are wrong? In June Cecil heard from the border that the Scottish lords were devising how this young man could be brought home and married "you know where." "You have a Queen," said a Scot to Throckmorton, "and we our Prince the Earl of Arran, marriable both, and the chief upholders of God's religion." Arran might soon be King of Scotland. The Dauphiness, who at the French Court was being called Queen of England, did not look as if she were long for this world: Throckmorton noted her swoons. Arran had escaped to Geneva. Early in July Elizabeth was busy, and so was Calvin, over the transmission of this invaluable youth to the quarter where he could best serve God and the English Queen. Petitions for aid had come from Scotland. Cecil foresaw what would happen: the Protestants were to be helped "first with promises, next with money, and last with arms" (July 8). But to go beyond the first stage was hazardous. The late King of England was only a few miles off with his fleet and veteran troops; he was being married by proxy to a French Princess; he had thoughts of enticing Catharine Grey out of England, in order that he might have another candidate for the throne, if it were necessary to depose the disobedient Elizabeth. And could Elizabeth openly support these rebels? In the answer to that question lay the rare importance of Arran. The Scottish uproar must become a constitutional movement directed by a prince of the blood royal against a French attempt to deprive a nation of its independence. Cecil explained to Calvin that if true religion is to be supported it must first convert great noblemen (June 22).

Then the danger from France seemed to increase. There was a mischance at a tournament and Henry II was dead (July 10). The next news was that "the House of Guise ruleth" (July 13). In truth, this was good news. Elizabeth's adversary was no longer an united France. The Lorrainers were not France; their enemies told them that they were not French. But the Duke and Cardinal were ruling France; they came to power as the uncles of the young King's wife, and soon there might be a boy born who would be Valois-Tudor-Stewart-Guise. A Guise was ruling Scotland also, and the rebellion against her was hanging fire. So early in August Cecil's second stage was reached, and Ralph Sadler was carrying three thousand pounds to the border. He knew his Scotland; Henry VIII had sent him there on a fool's errand; there would be better management this time. In the same month Philip turned his back on the Netherlands, never to see them more. Thenceforth, he would be the secluded King of a distant country. Also, Paul IV died, and for four

months the Roman Church had no supreme governor. The Supreme Governor of the English Church could breathe more freely. She kept her St Bartholomew (August 24). There was burning in Bartlemy Fair, burning in Smithfield—but only of wooden roods and Maries and Johns and such-like popish gear. "It is done of purpose to confirm the Scottish revolt": such was a guess made at Brussels (September 2); and it may have been right, for there was little of the natural iconoclast in Elizabeth. A few days later (August 29) Arran was safely and secretly in her presence, and thence was smuggled into Scotland. Probably she took his measure; he was not quite sane, but would be useful. Soon afterwards Philip's ambassador knew that she was fomenting tumults in Scotland through "a heretic preacher called Knox." That was unkindly said, but not substantially untrue. Early in October "the Congregation" began once more to take an armed shape. Châtelherault, that unstable "second person," had been brought over by his impetuous son. The French troops in Scotland had been reinforced; the struggle was between Scot and Frenchman. So, to the horror of Bishops-elect (whose consecration had not yet been managed), the table in Elizabeth's chapel began to look like an altar with cross and candles. "She will not favour the Scots in their religion," said Gilles de Noailles the French ambassador. "She is afraid," said the Cardinal of Lorraine. "She is going to marry the Archduke Charles who is coming here in disguise," said many people. Surely she wished that just those comments should be made; and so Dr Cox, by this time elect of Ely, had to stomach cross and candles as best he might.

The host of the Congregation arrived at Edinburgh; a manifesto declared that the Regent was deposed (October 21). She and the French were fortifying Leith; the castle was held by the neutral Lord Erskine. But once more the extemporised army began to melt away. Treasure sent by Elizabeth was captured by a border ruffian, James Hepburn, Earl of Bothwell, who was to play a part in coming tragedies. The insurgents fled from Edinburgh (November 6). In negotiation with Cecil, Knox was showing the worldly wisdom that underlay his Hebraic frenzies; he knew the weak side of his fellow-countrymen; without more aid from England, the movement would fail. Knox, however, was not presentable at Court; Lethington was. The Regent's Secretary had left her and had carried to the opposite camp the statecraft that it sorely needed. He saw a bright prospect for his native land and took the road to London. Cecil's third stage was at hand. There were long debates in the English Council; there were "Philipians" in it, and all that passed there was soon known at the French embassy. The Queen was irresolute; even Bacon was for delay; but, though some French ships had been wrecked, others were ready, and the danger to Scotland, and through Scotland to England, was very grave. At length Cecil and Lethington won their cause. An army under the Duke of

Norfolk was to be raised and placed on the border. Large supplies of arms had been imported from the dominions of the Catholic King. Bargains for professed soldiers were struck with German princes William Winter, Master of the Ordnance, was to take fourteen ships to the Forth. He might "as of his own hand" pick a quarrel with the French; but there was to be no avowed war (December 16). On the morrow Dr Parker was consecrated. He had been properly shocked by Knox's doings. "God keep us from such visitation as Knox hath attempted in Scotland · the people to be orderers of things!" (November 6). If in that autumn the people of Scotland had not ordered things in a summary way, Dr Parker's tenure of the archiepiscopate might have been precarious. A few days later and there was once more a Pope (December 25): this time a sane Pope, Pius IV, who would have to deplore the loss, not only of England, but of Scotland also. God of His mercy, said Lethington, had removed that difference of religion.

Once more the waves were kind to Elizabeth They repulsed the Marquis of Elbeuf (René of Lorraine), and suffered Winter to pass All the news that came from France was good. It told of unwillingness that national treasure should be spent in the cause of the Guises, of a dearth of recruits for Scotland, of heretics burnt and heretics rescued, of factions in religion fomented by the great Something was very wrong in France, for envoys came thence with soft words "Strike now," was Throckmorton's counsel; "they only seek to gain time." So a pact was signed at Berwick (February 27, 1560) between Norfolk and the Scottish lords who acted on behalf of "the second person of the realm of Scotland" Elizabeth took Scotland, its liberties, its nobility, its expectant heir under her protection, and the French were to be expelled. On second thoughts nothing was published about "the profession of Christ's true religion." Every French envoy spoke softer than the last. Mary Stewart had assumed the arms of England because she was proud of being Elizabeth's cousin. The title of Queen of England was taken to annoy, not Elizabeth, but Mary Tudor. All this meant the Tumult of Amboise (March 14–20). Behind that strange essay in rebellion, behind la Renaudie, men have seen Condé, and behind Condé two dim figures, Jean Calvin and the English Queen. Calvin's acquittal seems deserved. The profession of Christ's true religion was not to be advanced by so ill laid a plot. But a very ill laid plot might cripple France at this critical moment, and, before we absolve Elizabeth, we wish to know why a certain Tremaine was sent to Britanny, where the plotters were gathering, and whether Chantonnay, Granvelle's brother, was right in saying that la Renaudie had been at the English Court. Certain it is that Throckmorton had intrigued with Anthony of Navarre, with the Vidame of Chartres, with every enemy of the Guises; he was an apt pupil in the school that Renard and Noailles had founded in England. A little later (May 23) messages from Condé to the Queen were going.

round by Strassburg; and in June Tremaine brought from France a scheme which would put Breton or Norman towns into English hands: a scheme from which Cecil as yet recoiled as from "a bottomless pit."

Be all this as it may, the tumult of Amboise fell pat into Cecil's scheme, and on the 29th of March Lord Grey crossed the border with English troops. The Scottish affair then takes this shape:—A small but disciplined force of Frenchmen in the fortified town of Leith; the Regent in Edinburgh Castle, which is held by the neutral Erskine; English ships in the Forth; an English and Scottish army before Leith; very few Scots openly siding with the Queen-mother; the French seeking to gain time. We hasten to the end. An assault failed, but hunger was doing its work. The Regent died on the 11th of June; even stern Protestants have a good word for the gallant woman. Cecil went into Scotland to negotiate with French plenipotentiaries. He wrung from them the Treaty of Edinburgh, which was signed on the 6th of July. The French troops were to quit Scotland. The French King and Queen were never thereafter to use the arms and style of England. Compensation for the insult to her title was to be awarded to Elizabeth by arbitrators or the King of Spain. A pact concluded between Francis and Mary on the one hand and their Scottish subjects on the other was to be observed. That pact itself was humiliating. There was to be pardon for the insurgents; there were to be but six score French soldiers in the land; a Scottish Council was to be appointed:—in a word, Scotland was to be for the Scots. But the lowest point was touched when the observance of this pact between sovereign and rebels was made a term in the treaty between England and France. Cecil and famine were inexorable. We had to sign, said the French commissioners, or four thousand brave men would have perished before our eyes and Scotland would have been utterly lost.

And so the French troops were deported from Scotland and the English army came home from a splendid exploit. The military display, it is true, had not been creditable; there had been disunion, if no worse, among the captains; there had been peculation, desertion, sheer cowardice. All the martial glory goes to the brave besieged. But for the first time an English army marched out of Scotland leaving gratitude behind. Perhaps the truest victory that England had won was won over herself. Not a word had been publicly said of that old suzerainty; no spoil had been taken, not a town detained. Knox included in his liturgy a prayer that there might nevermore be war between Scotland and England, and that prayer has been fulfilled. There have been wars between British factions, but never another truly national war between the two nations. Elizabeth in her first two years "had done what none of her ancestors could do, for by the occasion of her religion she had obtained the amity of Scotland, and thus had God blemished the fame of the great men of the world through the doings of a weak

woman":—such was the judgment of a daughter of France and a mother in the Protestant Israel, of Renée, the venerable Duchess of Ferrara. Another observer, Hubert Languet, said that the English were so proud of the conversion of Scotland that they were recovering their old insolence and would be the very people to defy the imminent Council at Trent. The tone of Catholic correspondence changes: the Elizabeth who was merely rushing to her ruin, will now set all Europe alight in her downward course. That young woman's conduct, when we now examine it, will not seem heroic. As was often to happen in coming years, she had been pursuing two policies at once, and she was ready to fall back upon an Austrian marriage if the Scottish revolt miscarried. But this was not what men saw at the time. What was seen was that she and Cecil had played and won a masterly game; and Englishmen must have felt that the change of religion coincided with a transfer of power from incapable to capable hands.

All this had been done, not only without Spanish help, but (so a patriot might say) in defiance of Spain. To discover Philip's intentions had been difficult, and in truth he had been of two minds. Elizabeth was setting the worst of examples. Say what she would, she was encouraging a Protestant revolt against a Catholic King. She was doing this in sight, and with the hardly concealed applause, of the Netherlanders; a friar who dared to preach against her at Antwerp went in fear of his life; whole families of Flemings were already taking refuge in England. Philip's new French wife was coming home to him; his mother-in-law, Catharine de' Medici, implored him to stop Elizabeth from "playing the fool." He had in some kind made himself responsible for the religious affairs of England, by assuring the Pope that all would yet be well. But the intense dread of France, the outcome of long wars, could not be eradicated, and was reasonable enough. He dared not let the French subdue Scotland and threaten England on both sides. Moreover he was for the moment miserably poor; Margaret of Parma, his Regent in the Netherlands, had hardly a crown for current expenses, and the Estates would grant nothing. So in public he scolded and lectured Elizabeth, while in private he hinted that what she was doing should be done quickly. The French, too, though they asked his aid, hardly wished him to fulfil his promise of sending troops to Scotland. Then his navy was defeated by the opportune Turk (May 11); and the Spaniards suspected that the French, if guiltless of, were not displeased at the disaster.

This was not all. The Pope also had been humiliated. The conciliatory Pius IV had not long been on the throne before he sent to Elizabeth a courteous letter (May 5, 1560). Vincent Parpaglia, the Abbot of San Solutore at Turin, once the secretary of Cardinal Pole, was to carry it to her as Nuncio. She was to lend him her ear, and a strong hint was given to her that she could be legitimated. When she heard

that the Nuncio was coming, she was perhaps a little frightened; the choice between recantation and the anathema seemed to lie before her; so she talked catholically with the Spanish ambassador. But Philip, when he heard the news, was seriously offended. He saw a French intrigue, and the diplomatic machinery of the Spanish monarchy was set in motion to procure the recall of the Nuncio. All manner of reasons could be given to the Pope to induce a cancellation of his rash act. Pius was convinced or overawed. Margaret of Parma stopped Parpaglia at Brussels. How to extricate the Pope from the adventure without loss of dignity was then the difficult question. Happily it could be said that Pole's secretary was personally distasteful to Philip, who had once imprisoned Parpaglia as a French spy. So at Brussels he enjoyed himself for some months, then announced to Elizabeth that after all he was not coming to her, and in the friendliest way sent her some Italian gossip (September 8). He said that he should go back by Germany, and, when he turned aside to France, Margaret of Parma knew what to think: namely, that there had been a French plot to precipitate a collision between Pius and Elizabeth. At the French Court the disappointed Nuncio "made a very lewd discourse of the Queen, her religion and proceedings." As to Elizabeth, she had answered this first papal approach by throwing the Catholic Bishops into prison. And then, it is to be feared that she, or someone on her behalf, told how the Pope had offered to confirm her Book of Common Prayer, if only she would fall down and worship him.

In August, 1560, a Parliament met at Edinburgh, to do for Scotland what the English Parliament had done in 1559. The Pope's authority was rejected, and the Mass was abolished. Upon a third conviction the sayer or hearer of mass was to be put to death. A Confession of Faith had been rapidly compiled by Knox and his fellow preachers; it is said that Lethington toned down asperities. "To see it pass in such sort as it did" surprised Elizabeth's envoy Randolph. The Scot was not yet a born theologian. Lethington hinted that further amendments could be made if Elizabeth desired them (September 13), and she made bold to tell the Lutheran princes that Scotland had received "the same religion that is used in Almaine" (December 30). The Reforming preachers were few, but the few earnest Catholics were cowed. "This people of a later calling," as an English preacher called the Scots, had not known the disappointment of a young Josiah's reign, and heard the word with gladness. There were wide differences, however, between the proceedings of the two Parliaments. The English problem was comparatively simple. Long before 1559 the English Church had been relieved of superfluous riches; there was only a modest after-math for the Elizabethan scythe. In Scotland the kirk-lands were broad, and were held by prelates or quasi-prelates who were turning Protestant or were closely related to Lords of the Congregation. Catholic or Calvinist, the possessor meant to keep a

tight grip on the land. The Bishops could be forbidden to say mass; some of them had no desire to be troubled with that or any other duty; but the decent Anglican process, which substitutes an Edmund Grindal for an Edmund Bonner, could not be imitated. The Scottish lords, had they wished it, could not have thrust an ecclesiastical supremacy upon their Catholic Queen; but to enrich the Crown was not their mind. The new preachers naturally desired something like that proprietary continuity which had been preserved in England: the patrimony of the Church should sustain the new religion. They soon discovered that this was "a devout imagination." They had to construct an ecclesiastical polity on new lines, and they set to work upon a Book of Discipline. Elementary questions touching the relation between Church and State were left open. Even the proceedings of the August Parliament were of doubtful validity. Contrary to wont, a hundred or more of the "minor barons" had formed a part of the assembly. Also, it was by no means clear that the compact signed by the French envoys authorised a Parliament to assemble and do what it pleased in matters of religion.

An excuse had been given to the French for a refusal to ratify the treaty with England. That treaty confirmed a convention which the Scots were already breaking. Another part of the great project was not to be fulfilled. Elizabeth was not going to marry Arran, though the Estates of Scotland begged this of her and set an united kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland before her eyes. Perhaps it was well that Arran was crazy; otherwise there might have been a premature enterprise. A King of Scots who was husband of the English Queen would have been hateful in England; Scotland was not prepared for English methods of government; and Elizabeth had troubles enough to face without barbaric blood feuds and a Book of Discipline. She had gained a great advantage. Sudden as had been the conversion of Scotland, it was permanent. Beneath all that was fortuitous and all that was despicable, there was a moral revolt. "It is almost miraculous," wrote Randolph in the June of 1560, "to see how the word of God takes place in Scotland. They are better willing to receive discipline than in any country I ever was in. Upon Sunday before noon and after there were at the sermons that confessed their offences and repented their lives before the congregation. Cecil and Dr Wotton were present....They think to see next Sunday Lady Stonehouse, by whom the Archbishop of St Andrews has had, without shame, five or six children, openly repent herself." Elizabeth, the deliverer of Scotland, had built an external buttress for her English Church. If now and then Knox "gave her cross and candles a wipe," he none the less prayed for her and everlasting friendship. They did not love each other; but she had saved his Scottish Reformation, and he had saved her Anglican Settlement.

Then, at the end of this full year, there was a sudden change in France. Francis II died (December 5, 1560); Mary was a childless widow;

the Guises were only the uncles of a dowager. A mere boy, Charles IX, was King; power had passed to his mother, Catharine de' Medici and the Bourbons. They had no interest in Mary's claim on England, and, to say the least, were not fanatical Catholics. After some hesitation Mary resolved to return to Scotland. She had hoped for the hand of Philip's son, Don Carlos; but her mother-in-law had foiled her. The kingdom that had been conveyed to the Valois was not to be transferred to the Habsburg, and a niece of the Guises was not to seat herself upon the throne of Spain. The Scottish nobles were not averse to Mary's return, as Elizabeth would not marry Arran and there was thus no longer any fear that Scotland would be merged in France. Mary was profuse of kind words; she won Lord James to her side, and even Lethington was given to understand that he could make his peace. The treaty with England she would not confirm; she would wait until she could consult the Scottish Estates. Elizabeth regarded this as a dangerous insult. Her title to the Crown had been challenged, and the challenge was not withdrawn. Mary's request for a safe-conduct through England was rejected. Orders were given for stopping the ship that bore her towards Scotland, but apparently were cancelled at the last minute. She landed at Leith on the 19th of August, 1561. The long duel between the two Queens began. The story of it must be told elsewhere; but here we may notice that for some years the affairs of Scotland were favourable to the Elizabethan religion. Mary issued a proclamation (August 25, 1561) strikingly similar to that which came from Elizabeth on the first day of her reign. "The state of religion" which Mary "found publicly and universally standing at her home-coming was to be maintained until altered by her and the Estates of the realm." But she and the Estates were not at one, and her religious position was that of a barely tolerated nonconformist. Lord James and Lethington were her chief advisers, and her first military adventure was a successful contest with turbulent but Catholic Gordons. Also it pleased her to hold out hopes that she might accept Elizabeth's religion, if her claim to be Elizabeth's heir presumptive were conceded. The ratification of the treaty she still refused, asserting (a late afterthought) that some words in it might deprive her of her right to succeed Elizabeth if Elizabeth left no issue. She desired to meet Elizabeth; Elizabeth desired to meet her; and the Scottish Catholics said that Mary would not return as "a true Christian woman" from the projected interview. Her uncles were out of power. It was the time of the colloquy of Poissy (September, 1561); it was rumoured that Theodore Beza was converting the Duke of Guise, who talked pleasantly with Throckmorton about the English law of inheritance. The Cardinal of Lorraine publicly flirted with Lutheranism. Elizabeth learnt that her cross and candles marked her off from mere Calvinian Huguenots, though she kept in close touch with Condé and the Admiral. Moreover, the English Catholics were slow to look to

Scotland for a deliverer; the alien's right to inherit was very dubious; they looked rather to young Darnley, who was born in England and by English law was an Englishman and the son of an English mother. So the Elizabethan religion had a fair chance of striking root before the General Council could do its work.

The invitation to the General Council came, and was flatly refused (May 5, 1561). At this point we must turn for one moment to an obscure and romantic episode. From the first days of her reign the English Queen had shown marked favour to her master of the horse, Lord Robert Dudley—a young man, handsome and accomplished, ambitious and unprincipled; the son of that Duke of Northumberland who set Jane Grey on the throne and died as a traitor. Dudley was a married man, but lived apart from his wife, Amy, the daughter of Sir John Robsart. Gossip said that he would kill her and marry the Queen. On the 8th of September, 1560, when he was with the Queen at Windsor, his wife's corpse was found with broken neck at the foot of a staircase in Cumnor Hall. Some people said at once that he had procured her death; and that story was soon being told in all the Courts of Europe; but we have no proof that it was generally believed in England after a coroner's jury had given a verdict which, whatever may have been its terms, exculpated the husband. Dudley (the Leicester of after times) had throughout his life many bitter enemies; but none of them, so far as we know, ever mentioned any evidence of his guilt that a modern English judge would dream of leaving to a jury. We should see merely the unscrupulous character of the husband and the violent, opportune and not easily explicable death of the wife, were it not for a letter that the Spanish ambassador wrote to Margaret of Parma. That letter was not sent until its writer knew of Amy's death (which he mentioned in a postscript), but it professed to tell of what had passed between him, the Queen and Cecil at some earlier, but not precisely defined moment of time. It suggests (as we read it) that Elizabeth knew that Dudley was about to kill his wife. Cecil, it asserts, desired the ambassador to intervene and reduce his mistress to the path of virtue. Those who are inclined to place faith in this wonderful tale about a truly wonderful Cecil, will do well to remember that a postscript is sometimes composed before any part of the letter is written, and that Alvaro de la Quadra, Bishop of Aquila, was suspected by the acute Throckmorton of taking the pay of the Guises. At that moment the rulers of France were refusing ratification of the Edinburgh treaty, and were much concerned that Philip should withdraw his support from Elizabeth. The practical upshot of the letter is that Elizabeth has plunged into an abyss of infamy, will probably be deposed in favour of the Protestant Earl of Huntingdon (Henry Hastings), and will be imprisoned with her favourite. The sagacity of the man who wrote this can hardly be saved, except at the expense of his honesty. Howbeit, Elizabeth, whether she loved Dudley

or no (and this will never be known) behaved as if she had thoughts of marrying him, and showed little regard for what was said of his crime. One reading of her character, and perhaps the best, makes her heartless and nearly sexless, but for that reason indecorously desirous of appearing to the world as both the subject and the object of amorous passions. Also she was being pestered to marry the Archduke Charles, who would not come to be looked at, or Arran who had been looked at and rejected. Then (January, 1561) there was an intrigue between the Bishop of Aquila and the suspected murderer. Philip was to favour the Queen's marriage with the self-made widower, and the parties to this unholy union were thenceforth to be good Catholics, or at any rate were to subject themselves and the realm to the authority of the General Council.

There was superabundant falsehood on all sides. Quadra, Dudley, Cecil and Elizabeth, were all of them experts in mendacity, and the exact truth we are not likely to know when they tell the story. But the outcome of it all was that a papal Nuncio, the Abbot Martinengo, coming this time with Philip's full approval, arrived at Brussels with every reason to believe that Elizabeth would favourably listen to the invitation that he was bringing, and then, at the last moment, he learnt that he might not cross the Channel. There are signs that Cecil had difficulty in bringing about this result. Something stood in his way. He had to stimulate the English Bishops into protest, and to discover a little popish plot (there was always one to be discovered) at the right moment. It is conceivable that Dudley and Quadra had for a while ensnared the Queen with hopes of a secure reign and an easy life. It is quite as likely that she was employing them as unconscious agents to keep the Catholics quiet, while important negotiations were pending in France and Germany. That she seriously thought of sending envoys to the Council is by no means improbable; and some stout Protestants held that this was the proper course. But while Quadra and Dudley were concocting their plot, she kept in close alliance with foreign Protestants. Arrangements for a reply to the Pope were discussed with the German Protestant Princes at Naumburg (January, 1561); and strenuous endeavours were made through the puritanic Earl of Bedford to dissuade the French from participation in the Tridentine assembly. The end of it was that the English refusal was especially emphatic, and given in such a manner as to be a rebuff not only to Rome but to Spain. An irritating reference to a recent precedent did not mend matters: King Philip and Queen Mary had repulsed a Nuncio. Another reason could be given. In Ireland the Elizabethan religion, which had been introduced there by Act of Parliament, was not making way. In August, 1560, the Pope, who had already taken upon himself to dispose of two Irish bishoprics, sent to Ireland David Wolfe, a Jesuit priest, and conferred large powers upon him. He seems to have slipped over secretly from Britanny, where

he had lain hid. Elizabeth could say, and probably with truth, that his proceedings were hostile to her right and title. As to a Council, of course she was all for a real and true, a "free and general" Council; all Protestants were; but with the papistical affair at Trent she would have nothing to do. Pius had thought better of her; her lover's crypto-Catholicism had been talked of in high places.

The papal Legate at the French Court, the Cardinal of Ferrara, had some hope of succeeding where others had failed: "not as Legate of Rome or the Cardinal of Ferrara, but as Hippolito d'Este," an Italian gentleman devoted to Her Grace's service. There were pleasant letters; cross and candles were commended; she was asked to retain them "even as it were for the Cardinal of Ferrara's pleasure"; but hardly had the Council been re-opened at Trent (January 18, 1562) than Elizabeth was allying herself with the Huguenots and endeavouring to form a Protestant league in Germany. The dream of a France that would peacefully lapse from the Roman obedience was broken at Vassy (March 1, 1562), and the First War of Religion began. In April Sechelles came to England as Condé's envoy and was accredited by Hotman to Cecil. The danger to England was explained by the Queen's Secretary:—The crown of France would be in the hands of the Guisians; the King of Spain would help them; the Queen of Scots would marry Don Carlos, the Council would condemn the Protestants and give their dominions to a Catholic invader (July 20) On the other hand, Calais, Dieppe, or Havre, "perhaps all three," might be Elizabeth's, so some thought; indeed "all Picardy, Normandy, and Gascony might belong to England again." The Queen had been thinking of such possibilities; already in June, 1560, an offer of "certain towns in Britanny and Normandy" had been made to her. She hesitated long, but yielded, and on the 20th of September, 1562, concluded the Treaty of Hampton Court with the Prince of Condé. She was to help with money and men and hold Havre, Dieppe, and Rouen until Calais was restored. It was a questionable step, but Philip was interfering on the Catholic side, and Calais was covetable. Of course she was not at war with Charles IX; far from it; she was bent on delivering the poor lad and his mother from his rebellious subjects, who were also "her inveterate enemies," the Guises. Of religion she said as little as possible; but the Church of which she was the Supreme Governor affirmed in prayer that the Gallican Catholics were enemies of God's Eternal Word, and that the Calvinists were persecuted for the profession of God's Holy Name. The expedition to Havre failed disastrously. After the battle of Dreux (December 19, 1562) and the edict of Amboise (March 19, 1563), all parties in France united to expel the invader. The Earl of Warwick (Ambrose Dudley) and his plague-stricken army were compelled to evacuate Havre after a stubborn resistance (July 28), and the recovery of Calais was further off than ever. Elizabeth had played with the fire once too often. She never after this thought

well of Huguenots; and friendship with the ruling powers of France became the central feature of her resolutely pacific policy. However, when at the beginning of 1563 she met her Second Parliament, and the Reformed Church of England held its first Council, all was going well. Since October an English army had once more been holding a French town; a foolhardy plot devised by some young nephews of Cardinal Pole had been opportunely discovered, and the French and Spanish ambassadors were supposed to have had a hand in it. Some notes of Cecil's suggest effective parliamentary rhetoric:

> 1559 The religion of Christ restored. Foreign authority rejected... 1560 The French at the request of the Scots, partly by force, partly by agreement, sent back to France, and Scotland set free from the servitude of the pope. 1561 The debased copper and brass coinage replaced by gold and silver. England, formerly unarmed, supplied more abundantly than any other country with arms, munitions and artillery. 1562 The tottering Church of Christ in France succoured...

The Queen, it is true, was tormenting her faithful subjects by playing fast and loose with all her many wooers, and by disallowing all talk of what would happen at her death. It was a policy that few women could have maintained, but was sagacious and successful. It made men pray that her days might be long; for, when compared with her sister's, they were good days, and when they were over there would be civil war. We hear the preacher:—"How was this our realm then pestered with strangers, strange gods, strange languages, strange religion, strange coin! And now how peaceably rid of them all!" So there was no difficulty about a supply of money, and another turn might be given to the screw of conformity. Some new classes of persons, members of the House of Commons, lawyers, schoolmasters, were to take the oath of Supremacy; a first refusal was to bring imprisonment and forfeiture, a second death. The temporal lords procured their own exemption on the ground that the Queen was "otherwise sufficiently assured" of their loyalty. That might be so, but she was also sufficiently assured of a majority in the Upper House, for there sat in it four-and-twenty spiritual Lords of her own nomination.

The Spanish ambassador reported (January 14, 1563) that at the opening of this Parliament, the preacher, Nowell, Dean of St Paul's, urged the Queen "to kill the caged wolves," thereby being meant the Marian Bishops. Nowell's sermon is extant, and says too much about the duty of slaying the ungodly. Hitherto the Reformers, the men to whom Cranmer and Ridley were dear friends and honoured masters, had shown an admirable self-restraint. A few savage words had been said, but they had not all come from one side. Christopher Goodman desired that "the bloody Bishops" should be slain; but he had been kept out of England as a dangerous fanatic. Dr John Story, in open Parliament, had gloried in his own cruelty, and had regretted that in Mary's day the axe had not been laid to the root of the tree. At a time when

letters from the Netherlands, France or Spain were always telling of burnt Protestants, nobody was burnt in England and very few people lay in prison for conscience sake. The deprived Bishops seem to have been left at large until Parpaglia's mission; then they were sent to gaol. Probably they could be lawfully imprisoned as contumacious excommunicates. Martinengo's advent induced Cecil to clap his hand on a few "mass-mongers," and on some laymen who had held office under Mary. But in these years of horror it is a small matter if a score of Catholics are kept in that Tower where Elizabeth was lately confined; and her preachers had some right to speak of an unexampled clemency.

Rightly or wrongly, but very naturally, there was one man especially odious to the Protestants. When the statute of 1563 was passed, it was said among the Catholics that Bonner would soon be done to death, and the oath that he had already refused was tendered to him a second time by Horne the occupant of the see of Winchester. The tender was only valid if Horne was "Bishop of the diocese." Bonner, who, it is said, had the aid of Plowden, the most famous pleader of the time, threatened to raise the fundamental question whether Horne and his fellows were lawful Bishops. He was prepared to dispute the validity of the statutes of 1559: to dispute the validity of the quasi-papal power of "supplying defects" which the Queen had assumed: to attack the very heart of the new order of things. Elizabeth, however, was not to be hurried into violence. The proceedings against him were stayed; her Bishops were compelled to petition the Parliament of 1566 for a declaration that they were lawful Bishops; their prayer was not granted except with the proviso that none of their past acts touching life and property were to be thereby validated; and eleven out of some thirty-five temporal Lords were for leaving Dr Parker and his suffragans in their uncomfortably dubious position. Elizabeth allowed Lords and Commons to discuss and confirm her letters patent; she was allowing all to see that no Catholic who refrained from plots need fear anything worse than twelve-penny fines; but she had not yet been excommunicated and deposed.

A project for excommunication and deposition was sent to Trent from Louvain, where the Catholic exiles from England congregated. Like Knox and Goodman in Mary's reign, those who had fled from persecution were already setting themselves to exasperate the persecutor. The plan that found favour with them in 1563 involved the action of the Emperor's son, the Archduke Charles. He was to marry Mary Stewart (who, however, had set her heart on a grander match), and then he was to execute the papal ban. Englishmen, it was said, would never again accept as King the heir to the throne of Spain; but his Austrian kinsman would be an unexceptionable candidate or conqueror. The papal Legates at Trent consulted the Emperor, who told his ambassadors that if the Council wished to make itself ridiculous, it had better depose Elizabeth; he and his would have nothing to do with

this absurd and dangerous scheme (June 19). Soon afterwards he was allowing his son's marriage, not with the Catholic Mary, but with the heretical Elizabeth, to be once more discussed, and the negotiations for this union were being conducted by the eminently Lutheran Duke of Württemberg, who apparently thought that pure religion would be the gainer if a Habsburg, Ferdinand's son and Maximilian's brother, became King of a Protestant England. Philip too, though he had no wish to quarrel with his uncle, began seriously to think that, in the interest of the Catholic faith and the Catholic King, Mary Stewart was right in preferring the Spanish to the Austrian Charles; and at the same time he was being assured from Rome that it was respect for him which had prevented Pius from bringing Elizabeth's case before the assembled Fathers. She was protected from the anathema, which in 1563 might have been a serious matter, by conflicting policies of the worldliest sort. The only member of the English episcopate who was at Trent, the fugitive Marian Bishop of St Asaph, might do his worst; but the safe course for ecclesiastical power was to make a beginning with Jeanne d'Albret and wait to see whether any good would come of the sentence. Ferdinand, however, begged Elizabeth to take pity on the imprisoned prelates, and she quartered most of them upon their Protestant successors. The English Catholics learnt from the Pope, whom they consulted through the Spanish ambassadors at London and Rome, that they ought not to attend the English churches (October, 1562). As a matter of expediency this was a questionable decision. It is clear that the zealous Romanists over-estimated the number of those Englishmen whose preference for the old creed could be blown into flame. The State religion was beginning to capture the neutral nucleus of the nation, and the irreconcilable Catholics were compelled to appear as a Spanish party secretly corresponding with the Pope through Quadra and Vargas.

Simultaneously with the Parliament a Convocation of the province of Canterbury was held (January 12, 1563), and its acts may be said to complete the great outlines of the Anglican settlement. A delicate task lay before the theologians: no other than that of producing a confession of faith. Happily in this case also a restoration was possible. In the last months of Edward's reign a set of forty-two Articles had been published; in the main they were the work of Cranmer. In 1563 Parker laid a revised version of them before the assembled clergy, and, when a few more changes had been made, they took durable shape and received the royal assent. A little more alteration at a later day made them the famous "Thirty-nine Articles." To all seeming the leaders of English theological thought were remarkably unanimous.

A dangerous point had been passed. Just at the moment when the Roman Church was demonstrating on a grand scale its power of defining dogma, its adversaries were becoming always less hopeful of

Protestant unanimity. In particular, as Elizabeth was often hearing from Germany, the dispute about the Lord's Supper was not to be composed, and a quarrel among divines was rapidly becoming a cause of quarrel among Princes. Well intentioned attempts to construct elastic phrases had done more harm than good, and it was questionable whether the Religious Peace would comprehend the Calvinising Palsgrave. As causes of political union and discord, all other questions of theology were at this moment of comparatively small importance; the line which would divide the major part of the Protestant world into two camps, to be known as Lutheran and Calvinist, was being drawn by theories of the Holy Supper. It is usual and for the great purposes of history it is right to class the Knoxian Church of Scotland as Calvinian, though about Predestination its Confession of Faith is as reticent as are the English Articles. Had it been possible for the English Church to leave untouched the hotly controverted question, the Queen would have been best pleased. She knew that at Hamburg, Westphal, a champion of militant Lutheranism, "never ceased in open pulpit to rail upon England and spared not the chiefest magistrates"; it was he who had denounced the Marian exiles as "the devil's martyrs." Since the first moment of her reign Christopher of Württemberg and Peter Paul Vergerio had been endeavouring to secure her for the Lutheran faith. Jewel, who was to be the Anglican apologist, heard with alarm of the advances made by the ex-Bishop of Capo d' Istria; and the godly Duke had been pained at learning that no less than twenty-seven of the Edwardian Articles swerved from the Augustan standard. Very lately he had urged the Queen to stand fast for a Real Presence. Now, Lutheranism was by this time politically respectable. When there was talk of a Bull against Elizabeth, the Emperor asked how a distinction was to be made between her and the Lutheran Princes, and could take for granted that no Pope with his wits about him would fulminate a sentence against those pillars of the Empire, Augustus of Saxony and Joachim of Brandenburg. When a few years later (1570) a Pope did depose Elizabeth, he was careful to accuse her of participation in "the impious mysteries of Calvin," by which, no doubt, he meant the *Cène*. But though the Augustan might be the safer creed, she would not wish to separate herself from the Huguenots or the Scots, and could have little hope of obtaining from her Bishops a declaration that would satisfy the critical mind of the good Christopher. Concessions were made to him at points where little was at stake; words were taken from his own Württemberg Confession. When the perilous spot was reached, the English divines framed an Article which, as long experience has shown, can be signed by men who hold different opinions; but a charge of deliberate ambiguity could not fairly be brought against the Anglican fathers. In the light of the then current controversy we may indeed see some desire to give no needless offence to Lutherans, and apparently the Queen

suppressed until 1571 a phrase which would certainly have repelled them; but, even when this phrase was omitted, Beza would have approved the formula, and it would have given greater satisfaction at Geneva and Heidelberg than at Jena or Tübingen. A papistical controversialist tried to insert a wedge which would separate a Lutheran Parker from an Helvetic Grindal; but we find Parker hoping that Calvin, or, if not Calvin, then Vermigli will lead the Reformers at Poissy, and the only English Bishop to whom Lutheran leanings can be safely attributed held aloof from his colleagues and was for a while excommunicate. It was left for Elizabeth herself to suggest by cross and candles that (as her German correspondents put it) she was living "according to the divine light, that is, the Confession of Augsburg," while someone assured the Queen of Navarre that these obnoxious symbols had been removed from the royal chapel. As to "the sacrifices of masses," there could be no doubt. The anathema of Trent was frankly encountered by "blasphemous fable." Elizabeth knew that her French ambassador remained ostentatiously seated when the Host was elevated, for "reverencing the sacrament was contrary to the usages established by law in England."

Another rock was avoided. Ever since 1532 there had been in the air a project for an authoritative statement of English Canon Law. In Edward's day that project took the shape of a book (*Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*) of which Cranmer and Peter Martyr were the chief authors, but which had not received the King's sanction when death took him. During Elizabeth's first years we hear of it again; but nothing decisive was done. The draft code that has come down to us has every fault that it could have. In particular, its list of heresies is terribly severe, and apparently (but this has been doubted) the obstinate heretic is to go the way that Cranmer went: not only the Romanists but some at least of the Lutherans might have been relinquished to the secular arm. Howbeit, the scheme fell through. Under a statute of Henry VIII so much of the old Canon Law as was not contrariant nor repugnant to the Word of God or to Acts of the English Parliament was to be administered by the Courts of the English Church. Practically this meant, that the officials of the Bishops had a fairly free hand in declaring law as they went along. They were civilians; the academic study of the Canon Law had been prohibited; they were not in the least likely to contest the right of the temporal legislature to regulate spiritual affairs. And the hands of the Queen's ecclesiastical commissioners were free indeed. Large as were the powers with which she could entrust them by virtue of the Act of Supremacy, she professedly gave them yet larger powers, for they might punish offenders by fine and imprisonment, and this the old Courts of the Church could not do. A constitutional question of the first magnitude was to arise at this point. But during the early years of the reign the commissioners

seem to be chiefly employed in depriving papists of their benefices, and this was lawful work.

But while there was an agreeable harmony in dogma and little controversy over polity, the quarrel about ceremonies had begun. In the Convocation of 1563, resolutions, which would have left the posture of the communicants to the discretion of the Bishops and would have abolished the observance of Saints' days, the sign of the cross in baptism and the use of organs, were rejected in the Lower House by the smallest of majorities. It was notorious that some of the Bishops favoured only the simplest rites; five deans and a dozen archdeacons petitioned against the modest surplice. But for its Supreme Governor, the English Church would in all likelihood have carried its own purgation far beyond the degree that had been fixed by the secular legislature. To the Queen, however, it was of the first importance that there should be no more changes before the face of the Tridentine enemy, and also that her occasional professions of Augustan principles should have some visible support. The Bishops, though at first with some reluctance, decided to enforce the existing law; and in course of time conservative sentiment began to collect around the rubrics of the Prayer Book. However, there were some men who were not to be pacified. The "Vestiarian controversy" broke out. Those who strove for a worship purified from all taint of popery (and who therefore were known as "Puritans") "scrupled" the cap and gown that were to be worn by the clergy in daily life, and "scrupled" the surplice that was to be worn in church. Already in 1565 resistance and punishment had begun. At Oxford the Dean of Christ Church was deprived, and young gentlemen at Cambridge discarded the rags of the Roman Antichrist.

In the next year the London clergy were recalcitrant. The Spanish ambassador improved the occasion. In reply, Elizabeth told him that the disobedient ministers were "not natives of the country, but Scotsmen, whom she had ordered to be punished." Literal truth she was not telling, and yet there was truth of a sort in her words. From this time onwards, the historian of the English Church must be often thinking of Scotland, and the historian of the Scottish Church must keep England ever in view. Two kingdoms are drifting together, first towards a "personal" and then towards a "real" Union; but two Churches are drifting apart into dissension and antagonism. The attractions and repulsions that are involved in this process fill a large page in the annals of Britain; they have become plain to all in the age of the Bishops' Wars and the Westminster Assembly; but they are visible much earlier. The attempt to Scoticise the English Church, which failed in 1660, and the attempt to Anglicise the Scottish Church, which failed in 1688, each of these had its century.

For a while there is uncertainty. At one moment Maitland is sure that the two kingdoms have one religion; at another (March, 1563)

he can tell the Bishop of Aquila that there are great differences; but undoubtedly in 1560 the prevailing belief was that the Protestants of England and Scotland were substantially at one; and, many as were to be the disputes between them, they remained substantially at one for the greatest of all purposes until there was no fear that either realm would revert to Rome. From the first the Reforming movement in the northern kingdom had been in many ways an English movement. Then in 1560 Reformation and national deliverance had been effected simultaneously by the aid of English gold and English arms. John Knox was a Scot of Scots, and none but a Scot could have done what he did; but, had he died in 1558 at the age of fifty-three, his name would have occurred rather in English than in Scottish books, and he might have disputed with Hooper the honour of being the progenitor of the English Puritans. The congregation at Geneva for which he compiled his Prayer Book was not Scottish but English. His Catholic adversaries in Scotland said that he could not write good Scots. Some of his principal lieutenants were Englishmen or closely connected with England. John Willock, while he was "Superintendent" (Knoxian Bishop) of Glasgow, was also parson of Loughborough. "Mr Goodman of England" had professed divinity at Oxford, and after his career in Scotland was an English archdeacon, though a troublesome Puritan. John Craig had been tutor in an English family, and, instead of talking honest Scots, would "knap suddrone." But further, Knox had signed the English Articles of 1553, and is plausibly supposed to have modified their wording. A Catholic controversialist of Mary's day said that "a runagate Scot" had procured that the adoration of Christ in the Sacrament should be put out of the English Prayer Book. To that book in 1559 Knox had strong objections; he detested ceremonies; the Coxian party at Frankfort had played him a sorry trick and he had just cause of resentment; but there was nothing doctrinally wrong with the Book. It was used in Scotland. In 1560 a Frenchman whom Randolph took to church in Glasgow, and who had previously been in Elizabeth's chapel, saw great differences, but heard few, for the prayers of the English Book were said. Not until some years later did "the Book of Geneva" (Knox's liturgy) become the fixed standard of worship for the Scottish Church. The objection to all prescript prayers is of later date and some say that it passes from England into Scotland. This Genevan Use had been adopted by the chaplain of Elizabeth's forces at Havre, and, though he was bidden to discontinue it, he was forthwith appointed to the deanery of Durham. A Puritan movement in England there was likely to be in any case. The arguments of both parties were already prepared. The Leipzig *Interim*, the work of the Elector Maurice, had given rise to a similar quarrel among the Lutherans, between Flacians on the one side and Philipians on the other, over those rites and ornaments which were "indifferent" in themselves, but had, as some

thought, been soiled by superstition. The English exiles who returned from Zurich and Geneva would dislike cap, gown, and surplice; but their foreign mentors counselled submission; Bullinger was large-minded, and Calvin was politic. Scotland, however, was very near, and in Scotland this first phase of Puritanism was in its proper place. So long as Mary reigned there and plotted there, the Protestant was hardly an established religion; and, had Knox been the coolest of schemers, he would have endeavoured to emphasise every difference between the old worship and the new. It was not for him to make light of *adiaphora*; it was for him to keep Protestant ardour at fever heat. Maitland, who was a cool schemer, made apology to Cecil for Knox's vehemence: "as things are fallen out, it will serve to good purpose." And yet it is fairly certain that Knox dissuaded English Puritans from secession. In his eyes the Coxian Church of England might be an erring sister, but still was a twin sister, of the Knoxian Church of Scotland.

Elizabeth's resistance to the Puritan demands was politic. The more Protestant a man was, the more secure would be his loyalty if Rome were aggressive. It was for her to appeal to the "neutral in religion" and those "faint professors" of whom her Bishops saw too many. It is not perhaps very likely that surplices and square caps won to her side many of those who cared much for the old creed. Not the simplest and most ignorant papist, says Whitgift to the Puritans, could mistake the Communion for the Mass: the Mass has been banished from England as from Scotland: we are full as well Reformed as are the Scots. But Elizabeth feared frequent changes, was glad to appear as a merely moderate Reformer, and meant to keep the clergy well in hand. Moreover, in Catholic circles her cross and candles produced a good impression. When she reproved Dean Nowell for inveighing against such things, this was soon known to Cardinal Borromeo, and he was not despondent (April 21, 1565). Even her dislike for a married clergy, which seems to have been the outcome of an indiscriminating misogyny, was favourably noticed. It encouraged the hope that she might repent, and for some time Rome was unwilling to quench this plausibly smoking flax. But her part was difficult. The Puritans could complain that they were worse treated than Spanish, French and Dutch refugees, whose presence in England she liberally encouraged. Casiodoro de Reyna, Nicolas des Gallars, and Utenhove, though the Bishop of London was their legal "superintendent," were allowed a liberty that was denied to Humphry and Sampson; there was one welcome for Mrs Matthew Parker and another for Madame la Cardinale.

The controversy of the sixties over rites and clothes led to the controversy of the seventies over polity, until at length Presbyterianism and Episcopalianism stood arrayed against each other. But the process was gradual. We must not think that Calvin had formulated a Presbyterian system, which could be imported ready-made from Geneva to

Britain. In what is popularly called Presbyterianism there are various elements. One is the existence of certain presbyters or elders, who are not pastors or ministers of the Word, but who take a larger or smaller part in the government of the Church. This element may properly be called Calvinian, though the idea of some such eldership had occurred to other Reformers. Speculations touching the earliest history of the Christian Church were combined with a desire to interest the laity in a rigorous ecclesiastical discipline. But Calvin worked with the materials that were ready to his hand and was far too wary to raise polity to the rank of dogma. The Genevan Church was essentially civic or municipal; its Consistory is very much like a committee of a town council. This could not be the model for a Church of France or of Scotland, which would contain many particular congregations or churches. Granted that these particular Churches will be governed by elders, very little has yet been decided: we may have the loosest federation of autonomous units, or the strictest subordination of the parts to some assembly which is or represents the whole. Slowly and empirically, the problem was solved with somewhat different results in France, Scotland, and the Low Countries. As we have said, the month which saw Knox land in Scotland saw a French Church taking shape in a national Synod that was being secretly held at Paris Already Frenchmen are setting an example for constituent assemblies and written constitutions. Knox, who had been edifying the Church of Dieppe—that Dieppe which was soon to pass into Elizabeth's hands—stood in the full current of the French movement; but, like his teacher, he had no iron system to impose. Each particular congregation would have elders besides a pastor, there would be some general assembly of the whole Church; but Knox was not an ecclesiastical jurist. The *First Book of Discipline* (1560) decides wonderfully little; even the structure of the General Assembly is nebulous; and, as a matter of fact, all righteous noblemen seem to be welcome therein. It gradually gives itself a constitution, and, while a similar process is at work in France, other jurisdictional and governmental organs are developed, until kirk-session, presbytery, synod and assembly form a concentric system of Courts and councils of which Rome herself might be proud. But much of this belongs to a later time; in Scotland it is not Knoxian but Melvillian.

A mere demand for some ruling elders for the particular Churches was not likely to excite enthusiasm or antagonism. England knew that plan. The curious Church of foreign refugees, which was organised in the London of Edward VI's days under the presidency of John Laski, had elders. Cranmer took great interest in what he probably regarded as a fruitful experiment, and the Knoxian Church has some traits which, so good critics think, tell less of Geneva than of the Polish but cosmopolitan nobleman. Dr Horne, Elizabeth's Bishop of Winchester, had been the pastor of a Presbyterian flock of English refugees at Frankfort. With a

portion of that flock he had quarrelled, not for being Presbyterian, but because the Presbyterianism of this precocious conventicle was already taking that acutely democratic and distinctly uncalvinian form, in which the elders are the annually elected officers of a congregation which keeps both minister and elders well under control. Among Englishmen a drift towards Congregationalism appears almost as soon as the ruling elder.

The enthusiasm and antagonism were awakened by a different cry: it was not a call for presbyters, but a call for "parity," for an equality among all the ministers of God's Word, and consequently for an abolition of all "prelacy." As a battle cry this is hardly Calvinian; nor is it Knoxian; it is first audible at Cambridge. The premisses, it is true, lay ready to the hand of anyone who chose to combine them. The major was that Protestant principle which refers us to the primitive Church. The minor was a proposition familiar to the Middle Age:—originally there was no difference between the *presbyter* and the *episcopus*. Every student of the Canon Law knew the doctrine that the prelacy of Bishops is founded, not on divine command, but on a "custom of the Church." When the Puritan said that the episcopal jurisdiction was of popish origin, he agreed with Laynez and the Pope; at least, as had been amply shown at Trent, the divine right of Bishops was a matter over which Catholic doctors could quarrel bitterly. But the great Reformers had been chary of their words about ecclesiastical polity; there were many possibilities to be considered, and the decision would rest with Princes or civic Councils. The defenders of Anglican episcopacy occasionally told the Puritan that he was not a good Calvinist, and even Beza could hardly be brought by British pressure to a sufficiently dogmatic denunciation of prelacy. As to Knox, it is clear that, though he thought the English dioceses too large, he had no radical objection to such prelacy as existed in England. Moreover, the Church that he organised in Scotland was prelatic, and there is but little proof that he regarded its prelatic constitution as a concession to merely temporary needs. The word "bishop" was avoided (in Scotland there still were lawful Bishops of another creed); but over the "dioceses" stand "superintendents" (the title comes from Germany), who, though strictly accountable to the general assembly, are distinctly the rulers of the diocesan clergy. Between superintendent and minister there is no "parity"; the one may command, the other must obey. The theory that valid orders can be conferred by none but a Bishop, Knox would, no doubt, have denied; but some at all events of the contemporary English Bishops would have joined him in the denial.

Apparently Thomas Cartwright, a young professor of divinity at Cambridge, spoke the word (1570) that had not yet been spoken in Scotland. Cambridge was seething with Puritanism; the Bishops had been putting the vestiarian law in force; and the French Church had declared

for parity. "There ought to be an equality": presbyter and Bishop were once all one. But if the demand for parity was first heard south of the Tweed, it was soon echoed back by Scotland; and thenceforth the English Puritan was often looking northward. In Scotland much had been left unsettled. From August, 1561, to May, 1568, Mary Stewart is there; Rizzio and Darnley, Bothwell and Moray, Lethington and Knox, are on the stage; and we hold our breath while the tragedy is played. We forget the background of unsolved questions and uncertain law. Is the one lawful religion the Catholic or the Protestant? Are there two established Churches, or is one Church established and another endowed? There is an *interim*: or rather, an armed truce. The Queen had not confirmed the statutes of 1560, though mass-mongers were occasionally imprisoned. Nothing decisive had been done in the matter of tithes and kirk-lands and advowsons. The Protestant ministers and superintendents were receiving small stipends which were charged upon the ecclesiastical revenues; but the Bishops and Abbots, some of whom were Protestant ministers, had not been ousted from their temporalities or their seats in Parliament, and, as vacancies occurred, the bishoprics were conferred upon new occupants, some of whom were Catholics. The General Assembly might meet twice a year; but John Hamilton still went to Parliament as a reverend father in God and primate of Scotland. If Mary had succeeded in reestablishing Catholicism, we should probably have said that it had never been disestablished. And when she had been deposed and a Parliament held in her son's name had acknowledged the Knoxian Church to be "the immaculate spouse of Christ," much was still unsettled. What was to be done with the bishoprics and abbacies and with the revenues and seats in Parliament that were involved therewith? Grave questions of civil and ecclesiastical polity were open, and a large mass of wealth went a-begging or illustrated the beatitude of possession. Then in the seventies we on the one hand see an attempt to Anglicise the Church by giving it Bishops, who will sit in Parliament and be somewhat more prelatic than were Knox's superintendents, and on the other hand we hear a swelling cry for parity.

To many a Scot prelacy will always suggest another word of evil sound: to wit, Erastianism. The link is Anglican. The name of the professor of medicine at Heidelberg—it was Thomas Lüber, or in Greek Erastus—won a fame or infamy in Britain that has been denied to it elsewhere. And in some sort this is fair, for it was an English Puritan who called him into the field; and after his death his manuscript book was brought to England and there for the first time printed. His Prince, the Elector Palatine Frederick III, was introducing into his dominions, in the place of the Lutheranism which had prevailed there, the theology that flowed from Zurich and Geneva; images were being destroyed and altars were giving place to tables. This, as Elizabeth knew when the Thirty Nine Articles lay before her, was a very serious change; it

strained to breaking-point the professed unanimity of the Protestant Princes. Theology, however, was one thing, Church-polity another; and for all the Genevan rigours Frederick was not yet prepared. But to Heidelberg for a doctor's degree came an English Puritan, George Withers, and he stirred up strife there by urging the necessity of a discipline exercised by pastor and elders (June, 1568). Erastus answered him by declaring that excommunication has no warrant in the Word of God; and further that, when the Prince is a Christian, there is no need for a corrective jurisdiction which is not that of the State, but that of the Church. This sowed dissension between Zurich and Geneva: between Bullinger, the friend of the English Bishops, and Beza, the oracle of the Puritans. Controversy in England began to nibble at the Royal Supremacy; and in Scotland the relation between the State (which until 1567 had a papistical head) and the Knoxian Church, was of necessity highly indeterminate. Knox had written sentences which, in our rough British use of the term, were Erastian enough; and a great deal of history might have been changed, had he found in Scotland a pious prince or even a pious princess, a Josiah or even a Deborah. As it fell out, the Scottish Church aspired to, and at times attained, a truly medieval independence. Andrew Melvill's strain of language has been compared with that of Gregory VII; so has Thomas Cartwright's; but the Scottish Church had an opportunity of resuming ancient claims which was denied to the English. In 1572 an oath was imposed in Scotland; the model was English; but important words were changed. The King of Scots is "Supreme Governor of this realm as well in things temporal as in the conservation and purgation of religion." The Queen of England is "Supreme Governor of this realm as well in all spiritual or ecclesiastical things or causes as temporal." The greater continuity of ecclesiastical history is not wholly on one side of the border. The charge of popery was soon retorted against the Puritans by the Elizabethan divines and their Helvetian advisers:—Your new presbyter in his lust for an usurped dominion is but too like old priest.

In controversy with the Puritans the Elizabethan religion gradually assumed an air of moderation which had hardly belonged to it from the first; it looked like a compromise between an old faith and a new. It is true that from the beginning of her reign Elizabeth distrusted Calvin; and when she swore that she never read his books she may have sworn the truth. That blast of the trumpet had repelled her. Not only had "the regiment of women" been attacked, but Knox and Goodman had advocated a divine right of rebellion against idolatrous Princes. Calvin might protest his innocence; but still this dangerous stuff came from his Geneva. Afterwards, however, he took an opportunity of being serviceable to the Queen in the matter of a book which spoke ill of her father and mother. Then a pretty message went to him and he was bidden to

feel assured of her favour (September 18, 1561). Moreover, in German history Elizabeth appears as espousing the cause of oppressed Calvinists against the oppressing Lutherans. Still as time went on, when the Huguenots, as she said, had broken faith with her about Havre and Calais, and the attack on "her officers," the Bishops, was being made in the name of the Genevan discipline, her dislike of Geneva, its works, and its ways, steadily grew. Though in the region of pure theology Calvin's influence increased apace in England and Scotland after his death, and Whitgift, the stern repressor of the Puritans, was a remorseless predestinarian, still the Bishops saw, albeit with regret, that they had two frontiers to defend, and that they could not devote all their energy to the confutation of the Louvainists.

Then some severed, or half-severed, bonds were spliced. Parker was a lover of history, and it was pleasant to sit in the chair of Augustine, seeing to editions of Ælfric's Homilies and the Chronicles of Matthew Paris. But the work was slowly done, and foreigners took a good share in it. Hadrian Saravia, who defended English episcopacy against Beza, was a refugee, half Spaniard, half Fleming. Pierre Baron of Cambridge, who headed a movement against Calvin's doctrine of the divine decrees, was another Frenchman, another pupil of the law-school of Bourges. And it is to be remembered that at Elizabeth's accession the Genevan was not the only model for a radically Reformed Church. The fame of Zwingli's Zurich had hardly yet been eclipsed, and for many years the relation between the Anglican and Tigurine Churches was close and cordial. A better example of a purely spiritual power could hardly be found than the influence that was exercised in England by Zwingli's successor Henry Bullinger. Bishops and Puritans argue their causes before him as if he were the judge. So late as 1586 English clergymen are required to peruse his immortal *Decades*. There was some gratitude in the case. A silver cup with verses on it had spoken Elizabeth's thanks for the hospitality that he had shown to Englishmen. But that was not all; he sympathised with Elizabeth and her Bishops and her Erastianism. He condemned "the English fool" who broke the peace of the Palatinate by a demand for the Genevan discipline. When the cry was that the congregation should elect its minister, the Puritan could be told how in an admirably reformed republic Protestant pastors were still chosen by patrons who might be papists, even by a Bishop of Constance who might be the Pope's own nephew and a Cardinal to boot, for a Christian magistracy would see that this patronage was not abused. And then when the bad day came and the Pope hurled his thunderbolt, it was to Bullinger that the English Bishops looked for a learned defence of their Queen and their creed. Modestly, but willingly, he undertook the task: none the less willingly perhaps, because Pius V had seen fit to couple Elizabeth's name with Calvin's, and this was a controversialist's trick which Zurich could expose. Bullinger knew all the

Puritan woes and did not like surplices; he knew and much disliked the "semi-popery" of Lutheran Germany; but in his eyes the Church of England was no half-way house. As to Elizabeth, he saw her as no luke-warm friend of true religion, but as a virgin-queen beloved of God, whose wisdom and clemency, whose felicity and dexterity were a marvel and a model for all Christian Princes (March 12, 1572).

The felicity and dexterity are not to be denied. The Elizabethan religion which satisfied Bullinger was satisfying many other people also; for (to say nothing of intrinsic merits or defects) it appeared as part and parcel of a general amelioration. It was allied with honest money, cheap and capable government, national independence, and a reviving national pride. The long Terror was overpast, at least for a while; the flow of noble blood was stayed; the axe rusted at the Tower. The long Elizabethan peace was beginning (1563), while France was ravaged by civil war, and while more than half the Scots looked to the English Queen as the defender of their faith. One Spaniard complains that these heretics have not their due share of troubles (November, 1562); another, that they are waxing fat upon the spoil of the Indies (August, 1565). The England into which Francis Bacon was born in 1561 and William Shakespeare in 1564 was already unlike the England that was ruled by the Queen of Spain.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE SCANDINAVIAN NORTH.

The Scandinavian nations had entered somewhat late into the general stream of European history, and, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, were still not a little behind the rest of Western Europe in civilisation. But they were early brought into contact with the Reformation movement, and nowhere were its effects more generally felt or more far-reaching. In order to see to what extent this was the case, some attention must be paid to their earlier history.

It was not till the tenth century that Denmark, Norway, and Sweden began to exist as single monarchies; and it was under their early Kings that Christianity, first introduced some time previously, came to be the religion of all their people. From this time forward, although they were frequently devastated and rent asunder by internal warfare, the three kingdoms may be said to have taken their part, each in its own way, in European history. The Swedes, pressed by their heathen neighbours to the north and north-east, were at first unable to make much headway. The Norwegians, fully occupied by their activities beyond the seas, in Iceland, in parts of Scotland and Ireland, and even in far-away Greenland, never acquired much strength at home. Denmark was usually the most powerful kingdom of the three. Under the Kings of the Estridsen line the Danes vindicated their independence of the Empire, and conquered large territories from the heathen Wends and Esthonians on the shores of the Baltic; in fact, there was a time, under Valdemar the Victorious (1204-41), when the Baltic was to all intents and purposes a Danish lake. But the capture and imprisonment of Valdemar by Count Henry of Schwerin gave a blow to their power from which it never recovered. The increasing influence of the Teutonic knights and the Livonian knights of the sword on the one hand, and the rapid advance of Sweden under its Folkung dynasty on the other, still further shattered it. The Danes were further hampered by the commercial and naval rivalry of the Hanseatic League, and by frequent border warfare with the duchy of Holstein. Altogether, it looked for a time as though Sweden must take the place of Denmark as the chief

ower of the north. But although the Swedes gradually extended their way over Dalecarlia and Finland, their further extension was prevented y the advance of the Russians of Novgorod to the shores of the Gulf f Finland; and thus the peoples of the north were once more thrown ack upon themselves.

After several unsuccessful attempts at dynastic union, the three ingdoms were at length united. In 1363 Valdemar III (Atterdag) of)enmark had given his daughter Margaret in marriage to Hakon of Norway. On his death in 1375 Margaret's son Olaf became King of)enmark. Five years later, on the death of his own father, Olaf ucceeded to the crown of Norway; and Margaret became the real ruler f both realms in the name of her son. About the same time she laid laim to the crown of Sweden in right of her late husband Hakon; nd, although the claim was at first very shadowy, it became formidable hen the Swedish nobles espoused her cause. The King, Albert of lecklenburg, was defeated and made prisoner at the battle of Falköping; nd the Treaty of Lindholm (1393) left her undisputed mistress of weden. Thus the three realms were united under Queen Margaret, for er son Olaf had died in 1387. The personal union before long became constitutional one. In 1397 Margaret caused her grand-nephew Erik) be crowned King at Kalmar; and on that occasion there was con- uded, by nobles representing the three kingdoms, the famous Union f Kalmar, by which Sweden, Norway, and Denmark were declared to e for ever united under one King, each retaining its own laws and istoms. But the Union was not regularly promulgated or made widely nown, its terms were vague and indefinite, and they opened up more uestions than they solved. It was provided that a son of the reigning ing should be chosen if possible; but nothing was said as to the method y which the three kingdoms were to participate in the election. It was rovided that all should take up arms against the general enemy; but no eference was made to the carrying out of projects which concerned one f the three only. It is plain that nothing but pressing common interests r a strong ruler could render such an agreement permanent, and this as precisely what was wanting. On the one hand, Erik and his iccessors really ruled in the interests of Denmark; on the other, the ondition of Sweden, practically one of anarchy, made any settled overnment well-nigh impossible. Revolts were of frequent occurrence, nd before long the Danish governors were driven out, and Karl nudson, the leader of the higher nobility, became administrator *Riksföreståndare*) of Sweden. On the accession of the House of ldenburg to the throne of Denmark in 1448, Karl Knudson was pro- aimed King of Sweden, and soon afterwards of Norway also. Christian I on regained his hold over the latter realm; but from this time forward e Danish Kings were seldom able to make good their claims over weden, which continued to be ruled by Swedish administrators until

1520, when the death of Sten Sture the younger placed Sweden for the moment entirely in the hands of Christian II of Denmark. On the other hand, the Oldenburg line had gained ground elsewhere. In 1460 Christian I was chosen as Duke of Schleswig and Count of Holstein. But the great revolt of the Ditmarsch peasants, ending in the destruction of the Danish army, with two Counts of Oldenburg and the flower of the Schleswig-Holstein nobility, in 1500, further weakened the Danish throne, and indirectly helped to break up the Union of Kalmar.

The general effect of the changes which had taken place in the Scandinavian kingdom since the twelfth century had been to strengthen the power of the nobles at the expense of the King and the *bönder* or free peasants. Neither in Denmark nor in Sweden was there a law of heredity; and every election was secured at the cost of a "capitulation" which involved a certain weakening of the royal prerogative. In order to obviate the evils of a disputed succession, the Kings frequently attempted to secure an election in their own lifetime and left large appanages to their younger sons: with the result that the effort to transform these personal fiefs into hereditary possessions often led to civil wars, and still further weakened the Crown. Under pressure from the nobles the royal castles were step by step demolished everywhere, and the royal domain was gradually encroached upon. The *Rigsraad*, or Council of State, consisting entirely of the nobles and the higher clergy, altogether supplanted the ancient assemblies of the people as the final legislative authority. In Sweden King Albert (Count of Mecklenburg) was little more than the President of this Council. Even in Denmark things were not much better; and they did not improve. Under the Oldenburg Kings the Court was German rather than Danish, and its influence was none the greater on that account. Nor, owing to the privileges of the Hanseatic towns, was there a great merchant class, to act as a counterpoise to the nobles. And as for the *bönder*, formerly the most important class of all, their condition was pitiable indeed. By degrees their rights were encroached upon, till, from free and noble-born small proprietors, they became mere peasants. In Denmark they were at length compelled to have recourse to the practice of commendation, which ended, in the latter part of the fifteenth century, in a widespread system of serfage.

The power of the clergy had grown *pari passu* with that of the nobles. Down to the twelfth century, indeed, the Scandinavian Bishops were only suffragans of the see of Bremen. It was not till 1104 that the see of Lund, in the Danish province of Skaane, was raised to metropolitical rank, with jurisdiction over all the bishoprics of the three kingdoms; and it was only in 1152 that the famous mission took place of the Cardinal of Albano, Nicholas Breakspeare (afterwards Pope Adrian IV), which gave to the northern Churches their permanent character. Under his guidance Nidaros (Trondhjem) was made the

metropolitical see of Norway, and soon afterwards Upsala was raised to a similar position in Sweden; the payment of *Roma skat* was introduced, and the ecclesiastical system of the northern nations was remodelled on the lines which prevailed at the time in other parts of Western Christendom; though it was not till 1250 that a papal Bull took the choice of the Bishops from the people and gave it to the Chapters. From this time forward the power and the riches of the clergy had rapidly increased. They held large fiefs in all three countries; it is said that more than half of Denmark was in the hands of the Bishops, and Copenhagen itself was built on a fief of the Bishop of Roskilde. Their possessions, like those of the nobles, were exempt from taxation, nor were they liable to the same restrictions with regard to trade as the people at large. With some conspicuous exceptions, they were not less opposed to the Kings than were the nobles; quarrels respecting clerical immunities were frequent, and they generally ended in the infliction of ecclesiastical censures, followed by the surrender of the King at discretion and the payment of an indemnity. As a rule, the higher clergy had been trained abroad, and were not less foreign in feeling and sympathies than the Court itself. Owing partly to difficulties in securing confirmation at Rome, partly to the exaggerated importance that was attached to their civil and constitutional functions, Bishops elect frequently remained unconsecrated for years, their spiritual functions being carried out by others. Naturally, abuses were far from uncommon amongst them, and there was not much love lost between them and the people at large. Indeed the success of the Reformation, both in Denmark and in Sweden, was largely due to the fact that it put an end to the power of the clergy and despoiled them of their possessions.

I. THE REFORMATION IN DENMARK.

The accession of Christian II in 1513 marks the beginning of a new era. A man of great natural gifts but violent passions, his father had given him an education which at once developed his love for the people and his self-love, and at the same time made him one of the most learned monarchs of the day. He was sent to Norway to put down a rebellion in 1502, and as regent there he received his apprenticeship in government during a series of turbulent years. His marriage in 1515 with Isabella, sister of the future Emperor Charles V, obtained for him an influence in Europe such as for centuries no other King of Denmark had enjoyed. But he was cruel and treacherous, both by nature and of deliberate policy. These characteristics had already shown themselves in Norway: they were present throughout his reign, and after ten years they helped to drive him from his beloved Denmark. Thus, although he introduced many notable changes, he himself was overthrown by the reaction to

which they gave rise; and they were only carried out in their entirety by others after his downfall.

Christian had himself reconquered Norway for his father: at his own accession he found Sweden practically independent. On the death of the administrator Svante Sture in 1512 the *Rigsraad* had chosen the old Erik Trolle in his place and had decided in favour of union with Denmark. But a popular party led by Hemming Gadd, the Bishop of Linkœping, had risen against him and set up Sten Sture the younger in his stead; who, being a wise and statesmanlike leader, soon obtained the upper hand. There was still a strong party opposed to him however, under the leadership of Gustaf, the son of Erik Trolle and Archbishop of Upsala. In the course of the civil war which followed Gustaf was besieged in his castle of Stækeborg near Stockholm. He at once appealed to the Danes for help; and his assailants were excommunicated by Archbishop Berger of Lund, by virtue of the authority which he claimed as Primate of Scandinavia. Thereupon Sten Sture and the *Rigsraad* resolved that Trolle should be no longer recognised as Archbishop, and that he should be imprisoned and his castle razed to the ground. Gustaf at once appealed to Pope Leo X, who approved the excommunication of Sten Sture and called upon Christian to enforce it. From 1517 onwards, therefore, Christian was endeavouring by negotiation or otherwise to take possession of Sweden. At first he had little success, excepting that in 1518, after an attack on Stockholm which failed of its object, he suggested an interview with Sten Sture, demanded hostages for his own safety, and then carried them off to Denmark, Bishop Gadd and a young man named Gustaf Eriksson among them. In the following year he returned to Sweden with a large army of mercenaries. On January 18, 1520, Sten Sture was defeated in a battle fought on the ice on Lake Åsunden and so severely wounded that he died some weeks after. A second battle before Upsala left all Sweden in Gustaf's hands except Stockholm, which was valiantly defended by Sten Sture's widow, Christina Gyllenstjerna; and the promise of a general amnesty made in Christian's name by his general, Otte Krumpen, together with the persuasions of Gadd, who had gone over to the King's side, at length prevailed upon her to open the gates. Christian entered Stockholm, and was crowned King of Sweden on Sunday, November 4, 1520.

The event that followed is the blackest in Christian's life. On the Wednesday, during the coronation festivities, the Swedish magnates and the authorities of Stockholm were suddenly summoned into the citadel. Then Diederik Slaghoek, a Westphalian follower of the King's, and Jens Andersen, surnamed Beldenak, the Bishop of Odense, stood forth in the name of Gustaf Trolle and demanded reparation for the wrongs which, as they alleged, had been inflicted on him. Christian at once called for the names of those who had signed the act of deposition and committed them to prison; the only exceptions being Bishop Brask of Linkœping,

who had signed under protest, and another Bishop who now joined himself with Trolle as accuser. The following day, November 8, at nine o'clock, they were brought before a Court of twelve ecclesiastics, one of whom was Trolle, who thus became a judge in his own cause. The single question was put to them by Beldenak, whether men who had raised their hands against the Pope and the Holy Roman Church were not heretics? They could give but one answer. Thereupon they were told that they had condemned themselves, and were declared guilty of notorious heresy. On the very same day, at noon, they were brought forth into the market-place and there beheaded one by one before the eyes of the citizens. The Bishops of Strengnæs and Skara were the first to suffer; they were followed by the rest of the signatories, amongst whom was the father of Gustaf Eriksson, afterwards King of Sweden; and these by others of the principal nobles and citizens, who showed their sympathy too plainly, until the square ran with blood. A spectator counted more than ninety corpses before the day was done; and the ghastly work was not confined to one time or place. The bodies lay where they had fallen for three days, after which they were conveyed outside the town and burnt; the bodies of Sten Sture and of his young son, born since his excommunication, being exhumed and thrown upon the pyre. It was hoped that this terrible deed, which is known as the Stockholm bath of blood (*Stockholms Blodbad*), had secured Sweden to the Danes; as a matter of fact, as it has been said, the Union of Kalmar was drowned in it for ever. Fierce revolts broke out everywhere, and before long Sweden was independent under its own King Gustavus.

Christian was a more successful ruler at home than he had been in Sweden. He was well aware of the evils under which Denmark was groaning, and was resolved to provide a remedy. As the price of his election to the Crown he had been compelled to accept not only the conditions which had bound his father, but others even more onerous. One of these gave the judicial power entirely into the hands of the magnates; another nullified the royal right of conferring nobility; the last of all provided that if he broke his agreement in any particular, "then shall all the inhabitants of the kingdom faithfully resist the same without loss of honour and without in any wise by so doing breaking their oath of fealty to us." But from the first Christian treated his "capitulation" as a dead letter, and endeavoured in every way to increase the power of the burghers and the peasants. Himself brought up in the household of a burgher, Hans Metzenheim, surnamed Bogbinder, he surrounded himself with advisers of ignoble and often of foreign birth: Sigbrit, the mother of his beautiful Dutch mistress Dyveke, Diederik Slaghök, who has been mentioned already, a Malmö merchant named Hans Mikkelsen, and many more. Mother Sigbrit, as she was called, a woman of great capacity, was his chief counsellor in all fiscal and commercial matters. By her advice he

disregarded the *Rigsraad* altogether, subjected the higher orders to taxation, and violated all their most cherished privileges. Nor was it otherwise with the clergy, who soon found that in him they had a master. He levied from them by arbitrary and lawless methods the money which he really needed, but could not obtain in any legal way; Beldenak in particular was fleeced unmercifully. Meanwhile he skilfully availed himself of the jealousy between them and the nobles, who could not forget that many of them, including Archbishop Berger and Bishop Beldenak, were not nobly born, in order to overturn the power of both. For the time it seemed as if he had succeeded; and two great collections of laws, the so-called Secular and Ecclesiastical Code, which he put forth in 1521 and 1522 on his own authority, without submitting them to the *Rigsraad*, might seem to have marked the downfall of the aristocratic power. But in little more than a year they had been publicly burned and their author was a fugitive.

But Christian's work was not merely destructive. The people at large found in him a careful and wise ruler, who scrutinised every detail of civil life and government and was never weary of working for their good. His reforms of municipal government were at once elaborate and rigorous. He built great ships and put down piracy; he made wise treaties with foreign Powers. He extended commercial privileges to his burghers, and restricted those of the Hanseatic towns, endeavouring to make Copenhagen the centre of the Baltic trade; and with this object in view he encouraged Dutch merchants to found houses there, and extended a warm welcome to the rich banking-house of the Fuggers. He brought Flemish gardeners to Denmark in order that they might teach his people horticulture, and established them in the little island of Amager, where their descendants are to this day. He abolished the old "strand rights" and rights of wreck, and decreed that all possible assistance should be given to ships in peril and to shipwrecked mariners; and when the Jutland Bishops remonstrated with him, saying that there was nothing in the Bible against wrecking, Christian answered, "Let the lord-prelates go back and study the eighth commandment." He caused uniform weights and measures to be used throughout his dominions; he took steps for the improvement of the public roads, and made the first attempt at the creation of a postal system. He abolished the worst evils of serfage, and made provision for the punishment of cruel masters. His laws on behalf of morals and of public order are enlightened and wise; he abolished the death penalty for witchcraft; he founded a system for the relief of the sick. He did his utmost for the encouragement of learning. The University of Copenhagen, authorised by Pope Martin V in 1419, actually founded by Christian I in 1478 with three professors only, of law, theology, and medicine, first became important under Christian II. He founded a Carmelite House in Copenhagen, which was to maintain a graduate in divinity who should lecture daily in the

University; and the famous Paul Eliae or Eliaesen (Povel Helgesen), a student of Erasmus' writings and of Luther's earlier works, and an earnest seeker after Catholic reform, who has been not inaptly styled the Colet of Denmark, came from Elsinore to be the first head lecturer. Christian directed that schools should be opened for the poor throughout his dominions; he exerted himself to provide better school-books; he actually went so far as to enact that education should be compulsory for the burghers of Copenhagen and all the other large towns of Denmark.

Meanwhile Christian had been turning his attention to matters strictly ecclesiastical. Here too it cannot be said that he was anything but an opportunist, and it would be superfluous to credit him with any very pronounced convictions in favour of the Reformed doctrines; but there is no reason to doubt the earnestness with which he set to work to correct practical abuses. As early as 1517 there had come to Denmark a papal envoy named Giovanni Angelo Arcimboldo, afterwards Archbishop of Milan, with a commission to sell Indulgences, the right to act under which he purchased from the King for 1100 *gulden*. It was just at the time when Christian was engaged in negotiations with Sweden; and he resolved to make use of Arcimboldo as an intermediary. Soon however he discovered that the envoy, apparently in pursuance of secret instructions from the Pope, was negotiating independently with Sten Sture. Arcimboldo managed to escape to Lubeck with part of his booty; but the King at once gave orders for the seizure of what was left, and found himself in possession of a rich harvest in money and in kind. That this action did not involve any breach with the existing ecclesiastical system is plain from the fact that the victims of the terrible "Stockholm bath of blood" were put to death by Christian, not as traitors to the King, but as rebels against the Holy See.

But he had already gone further than this. In 1519 he wrote to his maternal uncle, Frederick of Saxony, begging him to send to the University of Copenhagen a theologian of the school of Luther and Carlstadt. Frederick sent Martin Reinhard, who arrived at Copenhagen late in 1520, and began preaching in the church of St Nicholas. But Reinhard unfortunately knew no Danish, and his sermons had to be interpreted, it is said by Paul Eliaesen. The effect was not happy: the sermons lost much of their force, and the preacher's gestures, divorced from his words, seemed grotesque and meaningless. At the next carnival the canons of St Mary's took advantage of the fact by dressing up a child and setting him to imitate the preacher. What was more serious, Paul began to find that he had no sympathy with Luther's developed position. Mocked by the people and bereft of his interpreter, Reinhard was sent back to Germany. Christian now endeavoured to attract Luther himself; and, although this proved impossible, Carlstadt came for a short visit. But the Edict of Worms (May, 1521), which placed Luther and his

followers under the ban of the Empire, was a hint too significant to be neglected, and for a time no more is heard of foreign preachers in Copenhagen.

Within Denmark itself, however, things were not standing still; and Christian's codes of laws, already referred to, were full of bold provisions for ecclesiastical reform. The monasteries were again subjected to episcopal visitation. Clerical non-residence, which, partly owing to local difficulties, was commoner in Norway and Denmark than elsewhere, was stringently forbidden. To make an end of the ignorant "priest-readers" (*laese-praester*) of whom the Danish Church was full, no candidate for holy Orders was to be ordained unless he had studied at the University and had shown that he understood and could explain "the Holy Gospel and Epistle" in Danish. The clergy were not to acquire landed property or to receive inheritances, "at least unless they will follow the precept of St Paul, who in his First Epistle to Timothy counsels them to be the husband of one wife, and will live in the holy state of matrimony as their ancestors did." The state which the Bishops were accustomed to keep up was forbidden: in journeying "they shall ride or travel in their litters, that the people may know them from other doctors; but they shall not be preceded by fife and drum to the mockery of holy Church." The spiritual Courts were no longer to have cognisance of questions of property. Most radical change of all, a new supreme tribunal was to be set up at Roskilde, by royal authority alone, consisting of "four doctors or masters well learned in ecclesiastical and imperial law," the decisions of which, as well ecclesiastical as civil, were to be final, the appeal to the Pope being abolished.

But Christian's new code never came into operation. His position was already one of great difficulty, and the toils were fast closing round him. He was in bad odour at Rome, partly on account of his attempted reforms, partly because of the three Bishops whom he had slain in Sweden; for Hemming Gadd had been put to death not long after the massacre of Stockholm, in spite of his loyalty to the King. This last matter was arranged without much difficulty. The Nuncio Giovanni Francesco di Potenza, whom Leo X had sent to Denmark, declared Christian innocent and found a scapegoat in Diederik Slaghoek, now Archbishop elect of Lund. For this and other crimes he was condemned to death, and burnt on January 22, 1522. But there were other difficulties which could not be met in this way. The citizens of Lübeck had declared war, and were soon devastating Bornholm and threatening Copenhagen. Christian was embroiled in a hopeless contest in Sweden. He had offended his father's brother, Frederick of Schleswig-Holstein, by obtaining the investiture of the duchy at the hands of Charles V, which he now abandoned by the Treaty of Bordesholm (August). And now, when everything was against him abroad, the seething discontent at home came to a head. Late in 1522 the nobles of Sjælland broke out

open rebellion. To meet this, Christian gathered together an army peasants, and summoned a council of nobles (*Herredag*) to meet at ıllundborg. The nobles and bishops from Jutland failed to put in an ıpearance, alleging that the wind and time of year made it impossible. ıereupon he summoned them and the representatives of the commons meet in a national assembly (*Riksdag*) at Aarhuus.

But it was too late: the Jutlanders had already assembled at Viborg, nounced their allegiance to him, and proclaimed Frederick King, ıtting forth at the same time a statement of grievances (March, 1523). letter in which they communicated the news to Christian reached him rly in the following month. The case was far from desperate. Norway d not declared against him; most of the islands were still his, and ıny of the chief citadels; the peasants were devoted to him, and so re many excellent leaders, chief amongst them being the brave lmiral Sören Norby. But Christian had lost heart. Every day ne renounced their allegiance, and an alliance which Frederick had ntracted with Sweden and Lubeck filled him with alarm. On April 13 left his capital and embarked for Flanders with his young Queen and ; three little children, and spent the next nine years in exile, often ıder great hardships. He continued vigorously to dispute Frederick's rone, but without success, in spite of the fact that he invoked the aid his powerful brother-in-law, and at length, late in 1529, was formally conciled to the Roman communion. Two years later he desired to ter into communication with Frederick, and gave himself into the nds of his uncle's commander, Knud Gyldenstjerne, on a safe-conduct. ıt in spite of this he was thrown into the dungeons of Sönderborg, ıere he remained for seventeen years, part of the time with no mpanion but a half-witted Norwegian dwarf; and he only left nderborg for a less rigorous captivity elsewhere, which endured till ; death in 1559.

Frederick's new position was no happy one. For years his dominions re torn asunder by civil war; and Christian was still recognised as the vful King by the Pope, the Emperor, and the Lutherans. The new ng owed everything to those who had elected him, and concession was turally the order of the day. To Norway he granted that hence-ward it should be a free elective monarchy, as Denmark and Sweden re. To the nobles he made even greater concessions than Christian II l made at his coronation, promising amongst other things that none t noble-born Danes should be appointed to bishoprics in future; ilst as regards the Church he bound himself "not to permit any etic, Luther's disciple or any other, to preach or teach, either openly publicly, against the holy faith, against the most holy father the pe or the Church of Rome." This last promise was more than once eated subsequently, in return for subsidies granted by the clergy; but h parties must soon have come to realise that a change was coming

whether they would or no. And although the actual settlement did not take place till after his death, the reign of Frederick I saw the real overthrow of the Church in Denmark.

Although the causes which brought this about were political rather than religious, they were not entirely so, and there were already not a few in Denmark who were propagating the new doctrines. Paul Eliaesen had indeed found himself unable to go the whole length with the Lutherans, and before long received from them the nickname of Paul Turncoat (Povel *Vendekaabe*) for his alleged instability. But Paul was neither a coward nor a renegade: he is almost the only representative in the north of that class of earnest and enlightened men who desired reform, both practical and doctrinal, without any general loosening of the ecclesiastical system. It is true that after Christian II turned him out of his lectureship in 1522 a rich canonry was founded for him by Bishop Lage Urne of Roskilde, the duties of which were to teach in the University and preach to the people. But he had lost his former office in consequence of a bold public denunciation of the King's cruelty; and he was not more flexible in the hands of Frederick I in 1526, when that monarch tried to make him a Lutheran propagandist. Yet, although he refused to throw in his lot with the extremists, and became more decided in his opposition to them as their action became more decided, he never ceased to inveigh against the corruptions of the old order. He translated selected tracts by Luther into Danish, and asserted many of his earlier theses, even whilst he condemned that teacher's later actions; and his last effort at peace-making, his *Christian Reconciliation and Accord*, written about 1534, is an earnest plea for peace on the basis of the historic system of the Church, with the services in Danish, communion in both kinds, marriage of the clergy and the like.

But although Paul could go no further than this, there were many of his disciples who went much farther. Chief amongst them was Hans Tausen, known as the "Danish Luther." The son of a peasant of Fyen (b. 1494) he had joined the Johannite priory of Antvorskov, where his abilities soon won recognition and he was sent abroad. After studying and lecturing at Rostock he was nominated professor of theology at Copenhagen; but his Prior, willing to see him still better equipped, sent him abroad again, and he now studied at Cologne and Louvain. Thence he passed to Wittenberg (1523), where he was listening to Luther's teaching with avidity when the alarmed Prior summoned him home in 1524 and imprisoned him. After a time he was transferred to the Johannite house at Viborg, in order that the Prior there, the learned Peder Jensen, might show him the error of his ways. He soon won Jensen's confidence, and was permitted to preach to the people after vespers. His preaching created a great sensation, but soon caused the prior to admonish and warn him; so one day, at the end of his sermon, Tausen threw himself upon the protection of his hearers, left the

monastery, and took up his abode in the house of one of the chief citizens.

Here he was joined by Jörgen Sadolin, who had studied with him under Luther, and whose sister he presently married; and the two continued their irregular preaching under the eye, and in spite of the prohibition of, the Bishop, Jorgen Friis. The same kind of thing was going on at Malmo, where under the protection of the Burgomaster, Jörgen Kok "the moneyer" (*monter*), one Klaus Mortensen the cooper (*tændebinder*), had begun preaching in the open air, until the people rose and insisted that one of the churches should be placed at their disposal. And the movement was spreading elsewhere. In 1524 there was printed a Danish version of the New Testament, which is commonly attributed to Hans Mikkelsen, formerly Burgomaster of Malmö, now a fugitive with the dethroned King, and which may be in part his work. It was imported into Denmark in very large quantities, and was largely read by the people in spite of episcopal prohibition, until its place was taken five years later by a far better version. This was the work of the gentle Christian Pedersen, known as the father of Danish literature. He had been a canon of Lund, but followed Christian II into exile, and became a convinced Lutheran; he returned to Denmark in 1531, and spent the rest of his life, till his death in 1554, in literary work for the cause of the Reform.

Such was the state of religion in Denmark when the struggle began which led to the overthrow of the Danish Church. In May, 1525, the nobles complained to Frederick I that the see of Lund had been over-long vacant: they pointed out that the Archbishop of Lund was "the gate and bulwark between Denmark and Sweden, as the Duke of Schleswig is between Denmark and Germany," and begged the King "no longer to allow that the Church in this land should be thus dealt with." The circumstances were peculiar. On the death of Archbishop Berger in 1519, the Chapter had elected their Dean, Aage Sparre; the King had nominated Jorgen Skodborg; and Leo X, to the great indignation of the Danes, tried to appoint a young Italian by provision. All three were set aside, and Diederik Slaghok was elected instead; but after his death there was a deadlock. Frederick now attempted to put an end to this by negotiation with the Pope. At first he seemed to have succeeded; Clement VII apparently accepted the nomination of Skodborg, and confirmed it. But what had happened in reality was that Skodborg had been induced to buy out his Italian rival, and by so doing had recognised his claim. Frederick was furious at finding that he had been tricked. On August 19, 1526, he published a rescript by which he repudiated the appointment of Skodborg and (with the consent of the *Rigsraad*) confirmed the election of Aage Sparre, saving however Skodborg's right of appeal to the King and the *Rigsraad*. The accustomed fees for the confirmation were paid to the King instead of the Pope.

This momentous act had consequences greater, probably, than those who took part in it anticipated. The procedure in question was accepted at the *Herredag* at Odense in December, 1526, not without careful stipulations for the safeguarding of ecclesiastical liberties; and from this time forward no Danish Bishop sought papal confirmation. As other sees fell vacant they were filled in the same way, confirmation being given by the King; but in each case the Bishop elect remained unconsecrated, such purely episcopal functions as were required being performed by one or other of the retired Bishops or those who, like the Bishop of Greenland, had never proceeded to their dioceses. Meanwhile Frederick was rapidly carried in the direction of further change. His son Christian, Duke of Schleswig, was already a convinced Lutheran; and in 1525 Albert of Brandenburg, the head of the Teutonic Order, renounced Catholicism and as Duke of Prussia became a suitor for the hand of Christian's daughter. The prospect of a strong Protestant alliance finally decided the question. Frederick, who had already shown Lutheran inclinations, from this time forward did his utmost to propagate the new views throughout his dominions. Naturally, not a few of his courtiers went with him; and in particular Mogens Gjœ, the high steward of Denmark, became an ardent Reformer.

His son Christian had already shown the way in Schleswig and Holstein. A Lutheran preacher named Hermann Tast had been working at Husum since 1522, and under his influence and that of other German preachers whom Christian had brought in as his chaplains, the new views were spreading everywhere. Early in 1526 Christian attacked Bishop Munk of Ribe, telling him that he ought to provide his diocese with married priests who could preach the Gospel. The Bishop temperately replied that the Gospel was already preached, and that, with regard to the marriage of the clergy, "when the Holy Church throughout Christendom adopts it, we will do the same." From this time forward Christian took matters into his own hands, and drew up a new Lutheran order which he imposed on the duchies; four clergymen who would not accept it were deprived, and the Duke's chaplains ordained others in their places. At Flensburg in 1529, after a disputation between Tast and the Anabaptist Melchior Hofmann, the doctrines of the Sacramentaries and Anabaptists were abjured; and the system was complete when Bugenhagen gave them a Lutheran "Bishop" in 1541, and the Danish ritual came into use in 1542. In Denmark Christian's Reforming tendencies were the cause of his never being acknowledged by the *Rigsraad* as successor to the throne during his father's lifetime.

Frederick followed his son's lead by nominating Tausen and others as his chaplains, thus at once exempting them from episcopal control and giving them protection. The plan was of course not unknown before, but it was so effective that it caused the Bishops no little alarm. At the

Herredag of 1526 they remonstrated against any preacher being licensed excepting with their consent, and "in such wise that he preach God's Word." Frederick was discreetly silent on the former point, and answered as to the latter that he never commissioned them to preach anything else; so the practice went on unchecked. Soon it produced its effect in a widespread defection, which so alarmed the Bishops that they endeavoured to secure the presence in Denmark of Eck or Cochlaeus, or some other champion of orthodoxy, in order that the doctrinal question might be thoroughly thrashed out. But this proved to be impossible, and they were thrown back on their own resources, and resolved to fight it out on the constitutional grounds with which alone they were familiar.

At the *Herredag* at Odense in August, 1527, they demanded that the people should be compelled to pay the tithes and other dues, which were now being refused on all sides. This was granted, in return for concessions to the nobles; as was also the claim that they should be supported in the exercise of Church discipline. But when they went on to protest against the propagation of the new doctrines and the protection of the preachers, Frederick replied that faith is free, and that each man must follow his conscience; that he was lord of men's bodies and of their goods, but not of their souls; and that every man must so fashion himself in religion as he will answer for it to God at the Last Day. He would no longer issue letters of protection to preachers; but if anyone molested those who were preaching what was godly and Christian, he would both protect and punish. He further suggested that the religious question should be decided by a national assembly convoked for the purpose; but this suggestion was at once repudiated by nobles and Bishops alike. He managed however to estrange the nobles from the Bishops by supporting their attacks on ecclesiastical property; and thus the ecclesiastical movement went on vigorously. In some places the old order was overturned altogether; at Viborg for instance even the Cathedral came into the hands of the Lutherans in 1529, and at Copenhagen, whither the King had summoned Tausen, they soon had the upper hand. Meanwhile, the Bishops seemed incapable of taking the only measures that could have been of any use. Preaching was almost in abeyance on their side; and in many places there were services only two or three times a year, and large numbers of country benefices were left entirely vacant. In 1530 for instance the sixteen extensive parishes of the diocese of Aarhuus had only two priests between them.

In 1530 the contest advanced a stage further. Preparations were being made in Germany for the Diet of Augsburg, which, it was hoped, would put an end to the religious controversy; and it seemed to the Bishops that the same happy result might be looked for in Denmark, if the Lutheran leaders could be made to appear before the King and the magnates. Twenty-one of them were accordingly cited to appear at Copenhagen before the *Herredag*, the Bishops taking care also to secure the help

of Paul Eliaesen and of two German theologians, one of whom was Dr Stageführ of Cologne. The session was opened, and several days were spent in accusations against the preachers as heretics. When the time came for his reply, Tausen suddenly produced a confession of faith in forty-three articles, which he and his fellows allotted among themselves and publicly defended day after day before great multitudes of excited people, in the Church of the Holy Spirit.

At first the Bishops only reminded the King of his oath to put down heresy; but finding that this had no effect either upon him or upon the assembly, they drew up twenty-seven articles against the preachers and asked that their opponents might be kept under restraint till the whole matter was decided. Tausen and his followers replied with an *apologia*, also in twenty-seven articles, in which they made a violent attack upon the whole Church system. But here the matter ended; the disputation which had been projected never took place because of a disagreement as to the language in which it was to be held. The Bishops asked that it should be in Latin, so that their German advocates might take part; the preachers insisted upon Danish, not only as the language best understood by the assembly, but because their whole appeal was to the common people. Naturally, the popular voice was on their side. There were loud outcries in Copenhagen against the Bishops and still more against the German doctors; and when Frederick dismissed the assembly, enjoining peace upon both parties, there could be no question that the Bishops had lost their case. They were disheartened in many ways: the ablest of their number, Lage Urne of Roskilde, was dead; Jorgen Friis of Viborg had been excommunicated, rather gratuitously, by the Pope; Beldenak had been deprived of his civil rights for disrespect to the Crown, and soon afterwards resigned; and his successor Knud Gyldenstjerne, the same who brought the dethroned Christian to Copenhagen, had so far thrown in his lot with the Lutheran movement as to make Sadolin a kind of coadjutor in his diocese, where he translated Luther's *Shorter Catechism* into Danish and issued it to the clergy to be used as a manual of instruction. On all hands the Lutherans were gaining ground. In some places there were iconoclastic outbreaks, though both now and throughout the period they were surprisingly few; and to this day many of the Danish churches contain their ancient altar-tables and reredoses, and the clergy wear the old copes. But everywhere the Reform progressed, until Elsinore was almost the only stronghold of Catholicism.

At this point however there came a period of disorder, caused by the death of Frederick I at Gottorp in Schleswig. The effect of Frederick's concessions to the nobles had been to divide the country into a series of semi-independent local governments; and nobles, Bishops, and people alike realised that they had everything to gain or to lose under the new King. Under these circumstances conflict was inevitable. No sooner had the Estates come together than the Bishops demanded that the

religious question should be dealt with. This was distasteful to many of the lay nobles; but in return for concessions they gave way, and it was resolved that the old order should be in all respects upheld, saving for actual abuses, that the Mass should be restored wherever it had been abolished, and that nobody should preach without the consent of the Bishop. Thus all the innovations introduced since the *Herredag* of Odense in 1527 were swept away. The Estates next proceeded to the election of a successor to the Crown. The late King, Frederick I, had left two sons, Christian of Schleswig-Holstein and his half-brother Hans. Most of the nobles favoured the former, whilst the Bishops placed all their hopes in the latter, who was a mere child and might still be kept from Lutheranism. Failing to come to an agreement, they resolved to postpone the election for a year; whereupon Mogens Gjœ and others left Denmark and endeavoured to persuade Christian to claim the crown by force. This he refused to do. But his self-restraint was of little use, for within a year civil war had broken out. The towns, smarting under the curtailment of their privileges at the hands of the lay nobles and of their religious liberties at those of the Bishops, began to look back longingly to the days of King Christian II, and soon broke out in revolt. The Burgomasters of Copenhagen and Malmo, who were at the head of the movement, made common cause with the democracy of Lübeck, whose forces took the field under Count Christopher of Oldenburg in order to place the imprisoned Christian II once more on the throne. Such at least was the avowed object of the so-called Count's War (*Grevefeide*); but behind these were plans of another kind, for the people of Lubeck, under their determined leader Wullenwever and his admiral Meyer, had only thrown in their lot with the Danish towns in order to get Denmark into their own hands and so to restore the old supremacy of the Hanseatic League in the north.

Christopher directed his forces towards Sjælland, and disembarked at Skovshoved on June 23, 1534. Copenhagen opened its gates to him, and Malmo soon drove out the garrison which had been placed there to overawe it; and before long the islands had all overthrown their oppressors, often with great ferocity, and proclaimed Christian II. Freedom of worship was at once restored. Bishop Roennov of Roskilde was deprived and his see given to the aged Gustaf Trolle, formerly of Upsala; and on Roennov offering a bribe of 10,000 marks in order to retain possession of the See, Trolle was transferred to Fyen, in the place of Gyldenstjerne, who was likewise ejected. From the islands Christopher turned his attention to the mainland. One of his lieutenants was sent to Jutland, where the peasants quickly gathered round him. The nobles at once marched against them, but were routed in the outskirts of Aalborg; and thus the greater part of Jutland once more owned Christian II's sway. But the turning-point of the war was already come. In the face of so great dangers the Estates had sought

an alliance with King Gustavus of Sweden, and another with Duke Christian of Schleswig-Holstein; by the terms of the latter, Christian was to unite with them against the common enemy, and differences were to be settled afterwards. He observed the terms loyally; but first the nobles of Jylland and then those of Fyen elected him their King; and at length, in an assembly held at Ry, near Skanderborg, the nobles and Bishops of the mainland united in proclaiming him.

Whether as ally or as King, everything depended upon him and his power. As Duke of Schleswig he made peace with Lubeck, thus becoming free to use his army elsewhere. Then he dispatched his best general, Hans Ranzau, against the peasants of Jutland, who shut themselves up in Aalborg. Ranzau took the town by assault, and crushed the rising in Jutland by putting the enemy to the sword, sparing none but women and children. Thence he passed into Fyen, and inflicted a crushing defeat upon the main body of Christopher's army on the hill of Öxnebjerg, near Åssens, in which Gustaf Trolle was mortally wounded. Meanwhile, Gustavus had invaded Skaane and Jylland, where his mere presence was enough to restore heart to the nobles, who had only given in their allegiance to Count Christopher through necessity. The Danish admiral Peder Skram (*Danmarks Vovehals*) attacked and defeated the great Lübeck fleet near Bornholm, thus regaining command of the sea; and Ranzau's army being thereupon transported to Sjælland, Copenhagen was invested by land and by sea. These disasters occasioned great disorders at Lübeck: Wullenwever and Meyer having in vain attempted to retrieve their fortunes by sending forth a new commander, Albert of Mecklenburg, were themselves removed from power, and Lubeck made its peace with Denmark. Gradually all resistance died away: Malmö opened its gates on April 2, 1536, Copenhagen surrendered at discretion on July 29, and on August 6 Christian III entered his capital in triumph. Soon after the victory of Åssens Norway had acknowledged his sway.

The accession of Christian, as the Bishops well knew, meant their downfall; and it was only actual necessity which had compelled them to accept him. Before the outbreak of the Count's War it had seemed that their cause might yet triumph: Tausen himself had been proceeded against and silenced, their own authority was restored, they had even reopened communications with Rome, which had been met, however, with chilling reserve. Now, all was lost. Christian III was a determined foe of the old order and had long ago expressed his intention of uprooting it. Nor were they long kept in suspense. On August 11 Christian consulted with his commanders, who agreed that the Bishops should be "pinioned." At four o'clock the following morning three of them were brought as prisoners into the castle. Four hours afterwards the King called together the lay members of the *Rigsraad*, and proposed that the Bishops should be deprived of their share in the government of the realm and that their possessions should be forfeited to the Crown.

They not only consented willingly, but also voted that their spiritual power should no longer be recognised, unless it should be approved by a general council of the Danish Church; and the remaining Bishops were forthwith sought out and arrested. This vote of the *Rigsraad* was approved by a national assembly (*Rigsdaag* or *Thing*) at Copenhagen, in which however the nobles took the chief part, which solemnly declared, on October 30, 1536, that they wished to keep the holy Gospel and no longer to have Bishops, and that the goods of the Church ought to be given up to the Crown in order to lighten the taxation of the people. Thus fell the Danish Bishops, as the result partly of the jealousy roused in the nobles by their greed of temporal power, partly of the fanatical Lutheranism of Christian III. They were not badly treated. The *Raad* of August 12 had decided that they were to be set at liberty and adequately supported, on condition of their promising to remain quiet; Roennov indeed continued in prison till his death in 1544, but the rest were set free, and two of them, Gyldenstjerne and Ove Bilde, ultimately conformed to the new order.

Christian now turned to Luther for help; and as the services of Melanchthon were not obtainable, Johann Bugenhagen, who had already organised the Reform in Pomerania, was sent in July, 1537, to accomplish the same work in Denmark. He was first called upon to crown Christian and his wife, by a usurpation of the ancient privilege of the Archbishops of Lund. Then the King nominated seven Superintendents, who were to take the place of the ancient Bishops, and who soon became known by their name. On September 2, Bugenhagen, himself no more than a presbyter, laid hands on them; and thus, by a deliberate innovation, the new Danish ministry was constituted. Of the persons chosen all were Danes, with the unfortunate exception of Wandel, a German who knew no Danish, and who had to be accompanied about his diocese by an interpreter. The most important of them was Peder Plade (Palladius), who had studied at Wittenberg, and became Bishop of Sjælland, and whose *Visitatsbog* gives us the most graphic picture that we possess of the internal life of the new Church. Tausen was so far discredited as to be for the time overlooked, though subsequently, on the death of Wandel, he became Bishop of Ribe.

On the same day (September 2) was published the new Church Ordinance (*Kirkeordinantsen*), which had been prepared by the Danish theologians and approved by Luther. It was subsequently sanctioned by the Assembly of Odense in 1539, and became, with additions made at various later synods (1540–55), the fundamental law of the Danish Church. The Bishops were to have under them a number of provosts or deans rural; and both alike were to be chosen by delegates of the clergy, who in turn were chosen by the people or their representatives, saving the rights of the nobles in some places; all being finally subject to the King's approval. These provisions, however, remained practically inoperative,

so far as episcopal elections were concerned. In each diocese there were to be two diocesan officers (*Stiftslensmænd*) who administered the confiscated Church property (or so much of it as had not fallen into the hands of the nobles) in the name of the King, and with the Bishops supervised the finances of the churches, hospitals, and schools, and confirmed the election of the lower clergy. These latter continued to hold their share of the tithe, to which the nobles still refused to contribute; the episcopal tithe, however, was confiscated and largely used for good works. The University, which had fallen into decay, was greatly enlarged; ecclesiastical revenues were applied to the support of men of merit and learning and the plans of Christian II with regard to education were at length carried out. A liturgy was compiled, and a new translation of the Bible from the original tongues was set on foot. For the rest, changes were made gradually, and there was at first little disorder. The Augsburg Confession was ultimately adopted with certain modifications, and Tausen's Confession of 1530 was dropped; on the other hand, the Formula of Concord was never accepted by the Danish Church. The monastic houses and Cathedral Chapters were not at once abolished, though their members were free to depart. The Chapter of Roskilde was engaged in a formal disputation with Palladius and others as late as December, 1543; this and most of the other Chapters only ceased to exist as the canons died out; and the convent of women at Maribo was not suppressed till 1621. Unfortunately, in other respects a very different temper prevailed as time went on. In 1551 Christian was compelled to issue an edict forbidding the nobles to treat the children of ministers as serfs. The power and influence of the nobles were, however, considerably increased under his rule, the downfall of clerical authority contributing largely to this result. The adherents of the Roman communion were treated with no little severity; and the Pole John Laski, when he left England at the commencement of Queen Mary's reign, found that there was no toleration in Denmark for such heretics as himself and his followers. Nevertheless, in spite of many drawbacks, the Reformation brought with it a distinct advance in civilisation; and, when Christian III died on New Year's Day, 1559, Denmark was in a more settled condition than it had been since the days of Queen Margaret, whilst trade and learning flourished as they had never done before.

II. THE REFORMATION IN NORWAY AND ICELAND.

The same thing could hardly be said with regard to the result of the changes in Norway and Iceland, where the ecclesiastical Order had been much less unpopular, and probably less in need of reform, than in Denmark. In fact, it cannot be said that in either case any popular

movement for Reformation existed. As regards Norway, Frederick I had made the same promises to uphold the Church and to put down Lutherans which he had made in Denmark; and his change of opinion was followed by the same results in both countries. In 1528 there came to Bergen a Lutheran preacher named Antonius, who seems to have devoted himself mainly to the German residents. Next year he was followed by two others, Hermann Fresze and Jens Viborg, who bore royal letters of protection similar to those which had been given to Tausen, and perhaps one or two more in other places. Meanwhile a systematic spoliation began of the religious houses and churches in Bergen. In 1528 the Nonnesæter cloister was secularised and given over as his residence to Vincent Lunge, the commander of the royal citadel (*Bergenhus*). Soon afterwards, the Dominican priory was destroyed by fire, apparently with the connivance of Lunge and the prior Jens Mortenssön, who are said to have divided the spoil; and the chapel royal was pillaged. But these were nothing compared with the outrageous proceedings of Eske Bilde, who replaced Lunge in 1529, and became known as the *Kirkebryder*, from his activity in destroying churches. About the citadel of Bergen stood a group of the richest and most venerable churches in Norway, together with the palace of the Archbishops of Trondhjem and the canons' houses. On the pretext (for it seems to have been no more) that they interfered with the effective character of the fortress, Frederick ordered an attack to be made on these. One by one they were destroyed, and their treasures removed to Denmark; and at length, in May, 1531, the ancient cathedral itself was demolished. This was done in pursuance of a bargain made some three months before with the Bishop of Bergen, Olaf Thorkildsson, by which he was to receive in exchange for his palace and cathedral the great monastery of Munkeliv, formerly Benedictine, now Brigittine, on the further side of the harbour. These proceedings naturally gave courage to the disaffected; the Lutherans now seized upon the Church of St Cross (*Kors Kirke*), whilst the German merchants intruded their minister Antonius in the Church of St Halvard, and another in the Maria Kirke.

Whether Archbishop Olaf Engelbrektsson of Trondhjem would have been able to do anything to stay the hand of the destroyer is perhaps doubtful, for his own diocese was not a little troubled by the same kind of thing, but as a matter of fact it was only when the work was complete that his suffragan of Bergen told him what was being done. Archbishop Olaf was already none too well disposed towards King Frederick. In 1523, whilst on his way to Rome to be consecrated, he had gone to Malines, where the exiled Christian II (who might still have claimed to be the legal King of Norway) then resided, and had sworn allegiance to him. On his way home the Archbishop had visited Copenhagen, and had done homage to Frederick I; nor does he seem

to have flinched from his allegiance. But the spoliations in Nor now made him feel that the Church would be safer under Christian at any rate that they could get on better without Frederick. He by no means the only man in Norway who held this view; and Chris himself was at this very time seeking an opportunity of invading Nor Before long it came. The Bishops and the Danish nobles in Nor were summoned to a *Herredag* to meet in Copenhagen in June, 1531; Archbishop, being provided with a good excuse in a great fire which de tated Trondhjem and almost destroyed the cathedral, remained beh On November 5 Christian reached the Norwegian coast with a flee twenty-five ships and a considerable army, and the next day he is a proclamation to the people of Norway in which he put himself forw as their deliverer, and summoned them to gather round him at C The Archbishop accepted and proclaimed him, as did the Bishops, in a somewhat lukewarm fashion; and Christian dissipated his ener and wasted his opportunity to such an extent that the following yea was compelled to make overtures to his uncle, which, as we have s ended in his imprisonment. Frederick was far too wise to push mat to an extremity, and the Bishops were glad to purchase their safety paying him fines; but two monasteries which had given help to Chris were secularised, and Knud Gyldenstjerne carried off no small amoun Church plunder to Denmark.

The death of Frederick I and the wars which followed once n plunged Norway into disorder. The Archbishop was at the head of Norwegian Council, and had he only known his own mind, it is poss that he might have chosen his own King, or even secured the independ of Norway. But he hesitated until Duke Christian had won his victories, and then it was too late. In May, 1535, the Bishop Oslo and Hamar, together with the chief nobles of the south, sign manifesto by which they accepted Christian III as King, provided he would promise to be faithful to the ancient laws of Norway; they sent this to the Archbishop and the northern lords for t signature. By this time Olaf was beginning to recognise the fact anything was better than a Lutheran King; and just then he receiv letter from the Emperor urging him to support the claims of Frede the Count Palatine, who was about to marry the daughter of imprisoned Christian II. He therefore temporised in the hope matters might settle themselves. Soon, however, there came emissaries of Duke Christian to Norway with instructions to p forward his cause, whereupon the members of his party decided to northwards to Trondhjem. They arrived towards the end of Decem 1535, and a Council was at once summoned, at which were present Bishops, the chief Danish nobles in Norway, and a considerable num of the *bonder* of the northern provinces. Vincent Lunge, the c adherent of Duke Christian, at once demanded that he should be ele

King, and that Norway should forthwith pay *skat* to him. To this it was answered, reasonably enough, that no election could be complete until the person chosen should have promised to observe the laws and customs of Norway, and that not till then was *skat* due. The *bönder* now withdrew and held a hasty consultation with the Archbishop, from which, probably roused by his words, they rushed in fury to the house of Vincent Lunge and slew him. Some of the other leaders barely escaped with their lives, and these were at once arrested and imprisoned by Olaf. There followed a short and ill-judged attempt on the part of Olaf to get the upper hand in Norway; but his party was less strong than he had supposed, and before long practically the whole land was subject to Christian, and Olaf was seeking terms. Presently losing all hope, the Archbishop collected all the treasure upon which he could lay his hands, together with the archives of the kingdom, and set sail for the Netherlands on April 1, 1537. He died at Lierre, in Brabant, on March 7 of the following year.

His departure left the way open for Christian III, who almost immediately took possession. He had already taken steps both to avenge himself and to put an end to what had long been a serious danger to his realm. By the third article of his "capitulation," made in the *Rigsdaag* at Copenhagen in October, 1536, he vowed that the kingdom of Norway should "hereafter be and remain under the Crown of Denmark, and not hereafter be or be called a separate kingdom, but a dependency of the kingdom of Denmark." Thus Norway lost its ancient liberties at a stroke. After this, although the "Recess" on religion which had been put forth at the same time (ratifying the changes which had already been made) said nothing of Norway, it was inevitable that the Norwegian Church should fall after the example of her sister of Denmark. One by one the Bishops were turned out, with two exceptions. Hans Reff, the Bishop of Oslo, a man of easy convictions, soon succeeded in convincing the King of his conversion to Lutheranism, and was reinstated in charge not only of Oslo, but of Hamar, where he remained till his death in 1545. Gebel Pedersson, the Bishop elect of Bergen, a man of far nobler character, had become a convinced Lutheran: in 1537 he went to Denmark, where Bugenhagen laid hands on him, and returned to take charge as Bishop of Bergen and Stavanger. For the rest, little or none of the care which was taken in Denmark to supply teachers, preachers, and schools, was extended to Norway. The undermanning of the Bishoprics was typical of what went on elsewhere. In large numbers of country places the old clergy were left till they died; at their death their places were left unoccupied. The few Lutheran pastors who were sent to Norway were unacquainted with the ancient Norse language, which was still, to a large extent, used in country places. Their attempts to obtain possession of the tithes led to frequent disputes which often ended in bloodshed; and on the whole

the Reformation caused as much harm to the social condition of the people in Norway, for half a century at any rate, as it did good in Denmark.

In ICELAND things were even worse. At first, indeed, there seemed to be hope of a conservative reformation; for Bishop Gisser Einarsen of Skalholt, who had been educated in Germany, began making changes on the lines of those in Denmark, though without overturning the ancient ministry; and an Icelandic version of the New Testament, printed in 1540, found plenty of readers. But when a formal attempt was made to introduce the Danish ecclesiastical system, there came a violent reaction. In 1548 Bishop Jon Aresen, of Holum, and Œgmund, the ex-Bishop of Skalholt, placed themselves at the head of what rapidly grew into a revolt against the Danish power. And although the former was taken prisoner in 1551 by David Gudmundarsen, and executed as a traitor, together with his two sons, his followers long strove to avenge his death. It was not till 1554 that they were put down, and the Reformation imposed by force on Iceland.

III. THE REFORMATION IN SWEDEN.

We now return to trace the fortunes of SWEDEN, where, as we have seen, the massacre of Stockholm had decided the fate of the Danish rule. But if the Swedish War of Independence was already inevitable, in its actual course it was the work of one man, the young Gustaf Eriksson, known to later ages as Gustavus Vasa from the fascine or sheaf (*vasa*) which was the badge of the family. Born in 1496 at Lindholm, he had studied from 1509 to 1514 at Upsala, after which he entered the service of the younger Sten Sture and fought under him against the Danes. Given as a hostage to Christian II in 1518 and carried away treacherously to Denmark, he had broken his parole in September of the following year and made his way to Lübeck, whence after some months he was allowed to proceed to Sweden, and landed near Kalmar on May 31, 1519. He spent the summer as a fugitive in the south, till the news of the massacre reached him and he fled to his own remote province of Dalecarlia. Here, after enduring many hardships and having many narrow escapes, he found himself early in 1521 at the head of a sufficient force of dalesmen to raise the standard of revolt. From this time forward it was never lowered until the whole country was in his hands and the Danes had been driven out. The first success of the insurgents was the capture of the town, though not of the citadel, of Vesterås. Upsala fell not long afterwards, and within little more than a year most of the Danish garrisons had been invested. Thanks to the undisciplined character of his troops two attacks upon Stockholm failed; and the same thing occurred elsewhere. But Christian's own throne was insecure; and when

once the power of Denmark was divided it could only be a question of time. On June 20, 1523, Gustavus entered Stockholm, and by July 7 the last Danish garrison in Sweden, that of Kalmar, had capitulated. Meanwhile Gustavus was no longer merely the leader of a band of insurgents. On July 14, 1522, he was able to issue a proclamation as the recognised commander of five provinces. An assembly at Vadstena on August 24 is said to have offered him the crown, which he refused, accepting however the office of Administrator, and adding that it would be time enough to choose a King when they had driven the foe out of the land. A general diet, so-called, met at Strengnäs on May 27, 1523. It is not clear whether the few magnates who still survived were summoned, but the diet nominated a new *Riksråd*, and then, on June 7 proceeded to elect Gustavus as King of Sweden.

The new King's position was no easy one. Although he had been duly elected he had little power; the peasants who were his strongest supporters were impatient of control, and the older nobles looked on him with jealousy, and almost with contempt. Sweden was so devastated by the war as to be practically bankrupt; the fields lay fallow, the mines were unworked, and many of the cities, Stockholm in particular, were desolated. The Swedish possessions in Finland were still in the enemy's hands; and the only ally of the Swedes, the city of Lubeck, had helped them in pursuance of its own schemes of aggrandisement, and was now claiming large sums of money in return for advances made and aid given during the course of the struggle. To appease them, the diet of Strengnäs had granted to Lubeck, Danzig, and their allies a monopoly of Swedish commerce; but ambassadors still followed Gustavus wherever he went, and urged the speedy payment of the account. To eke out the scarcity of money, Gustavus, like most of the kings of his day and to an even greater extent, had adopted the plan of debasing the coinage; but the effect was to inspire distrust, and before long he was compelled to circulate his *klippings* at a greatly depreciated rate.

He was at the end of his resources, and the only remedy seemed to be to turn to the Church, which was still as wealthy as ever. The Bishops as a whole were not unfriendly. Johan Brask, Bishop of Linkœping, an astute and far-seeing patriot, had early thrown in his lot on the winning side with Gustavus; the Danish Bishops of Strengnas and Skara had been replaced by Bishops elect who were favourable to him, and the vacant sees of Vesteras, Åbo, and Upsala (from the last-named of which Gustaf Trolle had fled) were likely to be filled in the same way. Moreover, Gustavus himself was just then in good odour in Rome. He had indeed been accused of heresy by Christian II in 1521; and his sojourn at and alliance with Lübeck lent colour to the charge. But his cause found a staunch defender in the famous Joannes Magni (Johan Magnusson), a Swedish scholar and canon of Linkœping who had lived away from his country for seventeen years without losing any of

his interest in its affairs. He had studied at Louvain under Adrian of Utrecht, a man very likeminded with himself; and in 1522 his old master, now Pope Adrian VI, sent him as Legate to Sweden. He arrived whilst the Diet of Strengnäs was in session, was warmly welcomed, and in turn spoke very warmly with regard to Gustavus, and seemed to look favourably on his plans for restoring efficiency to the Church. So much pleased with him was the new *Riksråd* that it addressed a letter to the Pope begging that he and the Bishops might be empowered to set to work at once. To this request no answer was ever made, but soon afterwards the Canons of Upsala chose Joannes to be their Archbishop.

Under these circumstances Gustavus, after having already in 1522 claimed an aid from the clergy, made in 1523 an urgent demand for money upon Bishop Brask, and issued a proclamation calling upon all the monasteries and churches to send him, as a loan, such church vessels and such money as could be spared, the amount which each diocese or monastery was expected to provide being stated in a schedule. The result was not satisfactory. The demands of the Lubeck ambassadors were indeed met, but the forced loan caused no little irritation in Sweden, and gave mortal offence at Rome. A letter from Adrian VI was presently received, saying nothing about the confirmation of the Bishops elect for which Gustavus had asked, and insisting on the restoration of Archbishop Trolle. The King wrote back in no measured terms, refusing to restore him, and in November 2, 1523, in demanding confirmation for the Bishop elect of Åbo, he threatened that if it was refused they would do without it, and that he himself would carry out the reformation of the Church. "Let not your Holiness imagine," he concludes, "that we shall allow foreigners to rule the Church in Sweden." These were plain words, and they appear to have had some effect. Early in 1524 the new Pope granted confirmation to Peter Magnusson, the Legate's brother, Bishop elect of Vesteras (in place of the former elect Peter Jakobsson or Sunnenvæder, removed for disloyalty); and thus on Rogation Day there was consecrated, in Rome, the Bishop from whom the whole of the later Swedish episcopate derived its succession.

Meanwhile Gustavus' position was not growing easier. Soon after his accession a war for the recovery of Finland had greatly taxed his resources. This was followed by an expedition against the "robbers' stronghold" of Sören Norby in the island of Gottland, which was rendered difficult by the ill-concealed jealousy of Denmark and Lübeck, and became a positive danger when Bernhard von Mehlen, the German knight to whom Gustavus had given the command of the expedition, turned traitor and endeavoured by means of it to reconquer Sweden for Christian II. Nor were things better at home. The further demand for money which he was forced to make upon clergy and people alike gave rise to serious discontent. When Peter Sunnenvæder was removed from Vesterås for disaffection, as has been mentioned above, he fled to

Darlecarlia, together with Knud, the Provost of Vesterås, at one time Archbishop elect of Upsala, who had also been turned out, and there they raised the standard of revolt. One plot followed another, now on behalf of Christian II, now on behalf of one of the Stures, and again, early in 1527, on behalf of a pretender to their name. Gustavus found no great difficulty in suppressing them, and generally took severe measures of reprisal; but he could not prevent their recurrence. An entire readjustment of burdens, as between the clergy, the nobles, and the people at large, was plainly needed; and when the King convoked the general Diet of Vesteras to meet in June, 1527, it was with the deliberate intention of taking action in the matter.

But it was no longer merely or chiefly a question of money; during the last few years Lutheranism had made great strides in Sweden, and the whole status of the Swedish Church was now at issue. The first preachers of the new opinions were Olaus and Laurentius Petri (Olaf and Lars Petersson, b. 1497 and 1499), the sons of a blacksmith at Orebro, who had sent them to study at Wittenberg with no idea of the consequences which were likely to follow. On their return to Sweden in 1519, Olaus went to Strengnas, where, as master of the Chapter school, he soon acquired a great influence over the Archdeacon, Laurentius Andreae (Lars Andersson, 1482–1552). For a time his teaching aroused no suspicion, and his sermons preached at the diet of Strengnås made a great impression; but he had already roused the suspicions of Bishop Brask, who accused him of heresy in a letter dated May 7, 1523, and from this time forward was constantly urging Gustavus to take action against him. At first the King seemed to agree, though he urged that persuasion was a better remedy than force. But the inducements to take the other side were very strong; and before long, partly from interest and partly from conviction, he had decided to give his support to the new preachers, still protesting however that he desired to reform and not to overthrow the Church.

In the summer of 1524 he summoned Olaus Petri to Stockholm as city clerk, sent his brother to Upsala as professor of theology, and made Laurentius Andreae, already his Chancellor, Archdeacon of Upsala. The advancing wave was checked for a moment in the autumn, when the iconoclastic excesses brought about at Stockholm by two Dutch Anabaptists, Knipperdolling and Melchior Rink, caused a reaction of popular feeling and drew from Gustavus a stern condemnation. At Christmas, however, a discussion held in the royal palace between Olaus Petri and Peter Galle, a champion of the old order, on the subject of the sufficiency of Scripture, once more gave them confidence; and in February, 1525, Olaus publicly set the rules of the Church at defiance by marrying a wife. A few months afterwards Gustavus directed Archbishop Magni to set on foot the translation of the Bible into Swedish. The work was actually planned out and the

books allotted to different translators; but, apparently owing to th opposition of Brask, it was never carried out; and the vacant place wa in part filled by a version of the New Testament, mainly the work o Andreae, which appeared in 1526, followed subsequently, in 1540–1, b a much better translation of the whole Bible, which was edited an largely made by Laurentius Petri. In the same year (1526) Gustavu sent a series of doctrinal articles to the prelates, intending to use the replies as the basis for a second and more exhaustive theological disputa tion; and although this plan fell through owing to the natural reluctan of some of the persons concerned to submit their faith to the tribun of popular opinion, the answers of Peter Galle were published, wi disparaging comments by Olaus Petri.

While thus undermining the claims of ecclesiastical authority, th King was also making insidious attacks upon the property of the Churc He systematically billeted his troops upon the monasteries; he left n means untried to get a hold upon their internal affairs; he sought o legal pretexts for reclaiming lands given to them by his ancestors. Th property of the Bishops suffered in like manner, and especially that the richest of them, the aged Brask, whom the King seems to ha despoiled with special malice or policy. Archbishop Joannes Mag suffered even worse things. Injudicious letters which he had written ecclesiastics abroad subjected him to a charge of conspiracy, on which l was arrested and imprisoned. The King allowed him to leave Sweden the autumn of 1526, ostensibly on an embassy to Poland; but it w really a banishment, from which he never returned. He took up his abo at Danzig and was soon afterwards confirmed by the Pope and cons crated with the barren title of Archbishop of Upsala. And thus length the way was prepared for further encroachment. By the ter of the summons, the Diet of Vesterås was to discuss questions of fait and especially the relations between Sweden and the Papacy.

The Diet met on June 24, 1527. There were present four Bisho four canons, fifteen lay members of the *Riksråd*, one hundred and twent nine nobles, thirty-two burgesses, fourteen deputies of the miners, a one hundred and four of the peasants. For the first time in Swedi history the Bishops were degraded from their place of honour next t King and were ranked below the senators. Smarting under the affro they held a secret meeting before the session of the following day, which, instigated by Brask, they signed a set of protests, a copy of whi was found fifteen years afterwards under the floor of the cathedr against anything that might be done in the direction of Lutheranism contrary to the authority of the Pope. When the Diet again met t Chancellor arose in Gustavus' name, reviewed the events of his reig and urged the necessity for a larger revenue, plainly pointing to t ecclesiastical property as the only source from which it might l obtained. Brask replied on behalf of the Bishops, saying that th

could not help the state of the kingdom; that they would do all in their power to put down abuses, but that, being directed by the Pope to defend their property, they could not do otherwise. This brought Gustavus himself to his feet. He enquired whether the members of the Diet considered this a fair answer. Thure Jönsson, the oldest amongst them, replied that it was. "Then," said Gustavus, "I will no longer be your King, and if you can find one who will please you better I shall be glad. Pay me for my property in the kingdom, and return what I have expended in your service; and then I solemnly protest that I will never return to this degenerate and thankless native land of mine." With this outburst he strode from the hall and left them to discuss at their leisure. He knew what the result must be; he had made Sweden, and it could not do without him. They had all the power in their hands, whilst his only asset was his own personality. But it was enough; and after three days the members of the Diet sent to say that they would conform to his wishes in all things.

Gustavus was now master. The Orders, with the exception of the clergy, made their proposals for dealing with the crisis. Contrary to all precedent, these proposals were formulated by the *Riksråd* instead of being voted on by the whole Diet; but the resulting decree, the famous Vesterås Recess, was nevertheless put forth in its name. It provided that all episcopal, capitular, and monastic property which was not absolutely required (and of this he was the judge) was to be handed over to the King; all the lands exempt from taxes (*Frälsejord*) which had been given to the Church since 1454 were to revert to the original owners; taxable land (*Skattejord*) was to be given up however long it had been alienated. Preachers were to set forth the pure Word of God and nothing else, whilst on the religious question in general a disputation was to be held in the presence of the Diet, and a settlement to be made on it as a basis. The disputation, if held at all, was naturally of no importance; and the Diet proceeded, on June 24, to pass the *Vesterås Ordinantie*, consisting of twenty-two regulations on the subject of religion. By these, detailed provision was made for the confiscation of the bulk of the Church property, in accordance with the terms of the Recess. No dignitaries were to be appointed until their names had been approved by the King; parish clergy were to be appointed by the Bishops, subject to removal by the King in case of unfitness; small parishes might be united where it was desirable, the Gospel was to be taught in every school, compulsory confession was abolished, monks were not to be absent from their monasteries without licence from the civil authority, and so forth. The result of these Ordinances was to give the King all the power that he could wish for over the Church. Dispirited and almost heartbroken, the aged Brask before long obtained permission to visit the island of Gottland, which was part of his diocese, crossed

the Baltic, and joined Archbishop Magni at Danzig. None of his brethren dared to oppose Gustavus' will.

Nor was it only the ecclesiastical order that suffered. In Sweden, unlike Denmark, none but the King gained power through the Reformation. The *Riksräd*, once all-important, was now nothing more than a complaisant royal Council. As leader of a popular movement, Gustavus had triumphed over the nobles, who were now glad to make common cause with the peasants wherever they were aggrieved. It should however be noted that one of the Vesteräs Ordinances gave the nobles the right to recover all their property which had been acquired by the churches and convents since the redaction of the year 1454, an important concession. There were revolts from time to time, generally directed in part at any rate against the new ecclesiastical order, as for instance in West Gothland in 1529 under Thure Jönsson, and again on a larger scale in 1542 under Nels Dacke. But they were in general easily put down, and always left Gustavus' power stronger than before. Nor was this all. The inevitable result of the changes which were being made was to put into abeyance rights which formerly belonged to one class or another of the community. These were by degrees seized upon by Gustavus as a kind of extension of his prerogative royal; and before long he was exercising without opposition an authority which no previous King of Sweden had ever possessed. In a Council held at Örebro early in 1540, the chief nobles were made to take an oath acknowledging Gustavus' sons, Johan and Erik, as the legitimate heirs to the kingdom; and the Act of Hereditary Settlement, passed on January 13, 1544, formally recognised hereditary succession in the male line as the rule of the Swedish constitution. Meanwhile the kingdom grew greatly in wealth and importance. Under Gustavus' influence the mines of the north became vast sources of wealth; manufactures grew up everywhere, and commerce was fostered by treaties with England, France, Denmark, and Russia. Before his death, which took place on Michaelmas Day, 1560, he had raised Sweden to a condition of unexampled prosperity, and had prepared the way for the great epoch of the next century.

We now return to the Swedish Church. Although the Ordinances of Vesteräs had shorn it of its grandeur and delivered it into Gustavus' hands, they had not abolished its essential character. On January 5, 1528, the Bishops elect of Skara, Strengnäs, and Åbo were consecrated by the Bishop of Vesteräs "by command of the King," without the confirmation of the Pope indeed, but with the accustomed rites; and on the following day Gustavus himself was crowned by them "with great pomp" in the Cathedral of Upsala. The monasteries were deprived of most of their property, and many of them ceased to exist at once; but the rest only died away by degrees, until at length there remained but a few nuns in the cloisters of Vadstena, Nadendal, Skenninge, and Skog, who lived on the King's bounty. But no man

in all Sweden died for the old faith. A certain number of the clergy were deprived, but the bulk of them still went on; and their general condition may perhaps be gauged by the fact that in not a few cases they married their former housekeeper or mistress in order to legitimatise the children. The Bishops had lost much of their property, but were still comparatively well off; for many years the new Archbishop of Upsala, Laurentius Petri (called Nericius), consecrated in 1531, used to support some fifty students in Upsala, and Bishop Skytte of Åbo supported eight abroad.

Gustavus himself did all in his power to prevent changes being forced on a reluctant people. A synod held at Örebro in 1529, under the presidency of Laurentius Andreae, provided that a lesson from the Swedish Bible should be read daily in all cathedrals, and that evangelical preachers should be appointed to carry the new doctrines about the country; but the King was so careful to preserve the old ceremonies, or such of them as "were not repugnant to God's Word," that he roused no little indignation amongst the more extreme Reformers as having fallen away from the Gospel. In 1528 he issued an ordinance insisting upon the payment of the legal dues of the clergy. Ten years later, when the nobles seemed to have learned too well the lesson which he had given them in the despoiling of churches, he restrained and rebuked those whose religious zeal manifested itself only in the way of destruction. "After this fashion," he said, "every man is a Christian and evangelical." Yet he recognised no limits to his own power: "it behoveth us as a Christian monarch," he wrote to the commons of the northern province, "to appoint ordinances and rules for you; therefore must ye be obedient to our royal commands, as well in matters spiritual as temporal." In 1540, when Laurentius Andreae and Olaus Petri were put on their trial for treason in not having made known to the King a conspiracy, the existence of which they had learned in confession, the Archbishop was compelled to be their judge. They were condemned to death, and only obtained pardon by the payment of a large fine.

But although Gustavus ever denied that he was setting up a new Church in Sweden, the changes became more pronounced as time went on, both in doctrine and discipline. Olaus Petri was putting forth a continual stream of tracts and pamphlets in Swedish which reflected his own strict Lutheranism, and by degrees they had a considerable effect. The first Swedish service-book, *Een Handbock påå Swensko*, appeared in 1529; it was followed in 1530 by a hymn-book, and in 1531 by the first Swedish "Mass-book" (*Ordo Missae Sueticae*), the Eucharistic doctrine of which was the "Consubstantiation" of Luther's earlier days; all these were many times reprinted in subsequent years, though the use of the Latin service was by no means everywhere abolished. Gustavus himself gradually went further. He repudiated prayers for the dead, and confession; for instance, he refused on his deathbed to listen to the

clergy when they urged him to confess his sins and seek absolution. He seems at one time almost to have contemplated the discontinuance of the episcopal office. In 1539 one George Norman, who had been recommended to him by Melanchthon, was appointed, by a commission not unlike that which had been given by Henry VIII to Cromwell a few years before, to superintend and visit the clergy and churches of Sweden; and a general visitation of the whole kingdom took place under his auspices in 1540. From 1544 the King refused to give the episcopal title to any but the Archbishop of Upsala; the rest he styled Ordinaries. As time went on, the dioceses were divided up into some twelve portions in all, each under its Ordinary. That this division was in itself desirable is likely enough, for the old dioceses were very large and unwieldy. Moreover some at any rate of Gustavus' new Ordinaries were in episcopal orders; *e.g.* when the old diocese of Åbo (Finland) was subdivided into Åbo and Viborg, the two new Ordinaries, Michael Agricola (who had previously been vicar-general of the whole diocese) and Paulus Juusten, were consecrated as Bishops together by Bishop Bothvid of Strengnäs in 1554. Nevertheless the effect of his action was undoubtedly to cast a slight upon the episcopal Order, and had there not been a reaction subsequently it must have been highly prejudicial if not fatal to the continued existence of episcopacy in Sweden.

The nine years of Gustavus' son and successor Erik XIV (*1560–9*), for some time the suitor of Elizabeth of England, were years of disaster for the Swedish State, and not less so for the Church. He inclined towards Calvinism, and already during his father's lifetime an overture had been made by Calvin towards the Swedish royal House by the joint dedication of a writing to father and son. It was ineffective so far as Gustavus was concerned, but Erik on his accession at once began to show favour towards Calvinists, announced his intention of making Sweden a refuge for distressed Protestants, and used his authority in the Church to bring about the suppression of a few fast days and other observances of the old order. His wasteful extravagance from the first pressed heavily on the State. But the real afflictions arose in the latter part of his reign, when he was engaged in war both at home and abroad, and everything was allowed to fall into neglect; churches fell into ruins, the church plate disappeared, benefices were not filled up, or only by incompetent persons, and the schools ceased to exist. At length in 1569 Erik was dethroned by his brothers, Johan and Karl, to whom their father had left hereditary dukedoms, and who seem to have agreed upon a joint conduct of the government after Erik's deposition; and some years later he was brutally murdered in prison, in pursuance of a vote of the members of the *Riksråd*, both lay and clerical.

The new King, Johan III, was a scholar and a theologian, whose reading of Cassander and other similar divines led him to lay all possible stress upon the ancient order of the Swedish Church, whilst

his love for his consort, Catharine, the sister of Sigismund II of Poland, who was a Roman Catholic, inclined him to seek a reconciliation with the Pope, if it could be obtained on reasonable terms. Under his influence a new Church order (*Kyrko-ordning*) was drawn up by the aged Archbishop Laurentius Petri and put forth by authority, which became the basis of the practice which prevails at the present day. Care is taken for the education and examination of the clergy, though the use by them of books of Homilies, such as the *Postilla* of Olaus Petri, is permitted. Latin psalms and prayers may still be used, and confession, excommunication, and public penance are provided for. The Bishop is elected by the clergy and others having competent knowledge, and consecrated in due course. The people choose their minister and present him to the Bishop, who either ordains him or another in his place; but it is to be noticed that the same form of service is to be used whether the person so "consecrated" is previously a layman or a minister from another charge. There are also assistant clergy or chaplains (*Kapellaner*) in the larger parishes. Before long the King was able to make further changes. The old Archbishop died in October, 1573; in June of the following year "the principal divines" were convened for the election of a successor, and "the votes of the great majority" were given to his son-in-law, Laurentius Petri Gothus, who was a student of the Fathers, and in many ways likeminded with the King.

In December the Archbishop elect was confirmed by the King after giving his assent to a series of seventeen articles which approved of the restoration of the convents, prayers for the dead, and the veneration of saints; and on July 15, 1575, he was consecrated "according to the complete Catholic use," with mitre, crosier, ring, and chrism, which were also used by the new Archbishop in future consecrations of his suffragans. A royal ordinance presently restored to the Archbishop that jurisdiction over his suffragans which had almost ceased to exist under Gustavus; and another gave the Archbishop and Chapter of Upsala a voice in all elections of Bishops. Other changes were made of the same general character, and some of the old convents were reopened. In 1576 a more important step was taken: a new liturgy on the lines of the reformed Roman Missal, the so-called "Red Book of Sweden" (*Röda Boken*), was published; it was fathered by the Archbishop in a preface, but was really the work of the King and his secretary, Peter Fechen. It was adopted, after considerable opposition (in which the Bishops of Linkœping and Strengnäs took part) at the Diet of 1577; and the King did his best to force it upon the whole Church. But he was never able to compel all the country clergy to use it; and his brother Karl, the Duke of Suthermanland (afterwards Charles IX), the ablest by far of the "brood of King Gustavus," not only refused to adopt it, but made himself the champion of the *Kyrko-ordning* of 1571 and of all who suffered for their fidelity to it. The result during

Johan's lifetime was estrangement, and very nearly civil war, betwee the brothers; after his death it led to the triumph of Lutheranism a the Upsala *möte.*

All this time the King was carrying on negotiations with the Papac So early as 1572 Cardinal Stanislaus Hosius was writing hopefully of hi conversion. In 1576 two Jesuits from Louvain, Florentius Feyt an Laurentius the Norwegian, appeared at Stockholm in the guise of evar gelical preachers. They were instructed to proceed with great cautio The Cardinal gave directions that the last-named was to extol faith an depreciate works without faith, to preach Christ as the only mediato and His cross as the only means of salvation; "and thereupon," he prc ceeded, "let them show that nothing else has been preached in the papa Church." We know from their own account that at the King's biddin they concealed their real condition and were taken for Lutherans; an the clergy were compelled to receive their instruction, which was carrie on in the spirit of Hosius' directions. In the same year the Kin sent messengers to Rome to negociate for the restoration of the pap authority in Sweden. It soon became evident that he was asking fc conditions which were not likely to be granted; he demanded, among other things, the concession of the Cup to the laity, the partial use Swedish in the liturgy, the surrender of clerical exemptions, toleratio of the marriage of the clergy (though with a preference for celibacy and the condonation of all that had been done in the past.

The time was past for such concessions, although hopes of somethin of the kind were held out more than once by Cardinal Hosius in h letters. In 1577 however the Jesuit Antony Possevin was sent to th north, with a commission as Legate to the Emperor, and instructions t use all his influence with King Johan. He made his appearance in th following year; and so great was the impression which he produced upc the King that after a few interviews, as we are told in his reports, Joha declared his willingness to make the Tridentine profession of faith wit out waiting to see what concessions the Pope might be willing to mal towards Sweden. He accordingly did so, made his confession and wa absolved (penance being imposed upon him for the murder of his brothe for which he had always felt the deepest remorse), and received th Communion in the Roman manner. This year, then, marks the zenit of the papal influence. About the same time Bishop Martin Olafssc of Linkœping, who had always been opposed to the direction in whic things were moving in the Swedish Church, was deposed and degrade for calling the Pope antichrist. Luther's Catechism, which had been use in the schools for some years, was made to give place to that of Canisiu many Jesuits were admitted into the country, on one pretext or anothe and large numbers of Swedish boys were sent abroad to be educated i their seminaries; above all, the primatial see was kept vacant fc four years after the death of Laurentius Petri Gothus in 1579, in th

hope that it might next be filled by an Archbishop of the Roman obedience.

This hope was doomed to be disappointed, for the proposed surrender proved to be less attractive on a nearer view. The King's plans in religion were closely bound up with political schemes which had for their object the obtaining for himself the Duchies of Bari and Rossani in right of his wife, whose mother was a Sforza; and these had just received a check. Gregory XIII declined to make the concessions which Johan thought that he had been led to expect; and on further consideration he found himself too honestly convinced of the essential soundness of the position of the Swedish Church to be content to give up all that had been won already. The last shreds of the influence of the Romanising party disappeared entirely after the death of Queen Catharine in 1584; the Jesuits and their *fautores* were once more expelled; and Johan, after turning his thoughts for a moment towards the orthodox east, settled down to the work of consolidating the Swedish Church as he found it.

Not long afterwards, however, the question was reopened, and in a more acute form, by the death of Johan III on November 17, 1592. The crown fell to his son Sigismund, who had been elected King of Poland in 1586, and who was a convinced Roman Catholic. With the consent of the *Riksråd*, his uncle Duke Charles at once assumed the government in his name; and together they resolved to make provision for the maintenance of Protestantism before the new King arrived. The *Råd* was anxious that the matter should be dealt with by certain members of their own body in conjunction with the delegates of the clergy; but Charles had made his brother promise two years before that a general assembly (*Kyrko-mote*) should be held, and he assented to the demand of the clergy that it should take place now. Accordingly a synod was convened which was attended by deputies both clerical and lay from all parts of the kingdom, though Finland was but sparsely represented. There were present, in addition to the members of the *Riksråd*, four Bishops (most of the sees were vacant, and were filled whilst the Synod was still in session), over three hundred clergy, and nearly as many nobles and representatives of the citizens, miners, and peasants. The famous "*Upsala-mote*" was opened on February 25, 1593, Nicolaus Bothniensis, one of the professors of theology at Upsala, being chosen as speaker. The assembly first laid down the rule of Scripture as the basis of all doctrine. Then it sought a doctrinal standard; and the obvious one was the Augsburg Confession, which had already been commonly accepted in Sweden, though it had never been definitely adopted by the Swedish Church. The articles were now gone through one by one, after which it was solemnly received as the confession of the Swedish Church. Luther's Catechism was again made the basis for instruction in religion; the use of the "Red Book" was abolished, and Laurentius Petri's Church Ordinance once more became the standard of worship, subject however

to a certain amount of pruning in the matter of ritual. After this the Synod proceeded to the details of practical reform.

The Upsala *möte* may be considered the coping-stone of the Swedish Reformation. Sigismund came to the throne with the knowledge that his new kingdom had made a definite stand from which there could be no withdrawal; and although many efforts were made during his reign on behalf of Roman Catholicism, first for concurrent establishment, and then for bare toleration, the issue was never for a moment doubtful. The Swedish Church was definitely committed to Lutheranism; the clergy continued to be an estate of the realm down to the middle of the nineteenth century; and separation from the national communion was so severely punished that until modern days organised dissent was practically unknown. The endeavours of Charles IX, the most learned of the royal brothers, to widen the doctrinal basis of the Swedish Church, were on the whole unsuccessful. But it was not only in Sweden that the *mote* had far-reaching consequences. The definite adhesion of Sweden to the Augsburg Confession gave strength to the cause of Protestantism everywhere: it opened the way for the Protestant League of the North in the following century.

NOTE ON THE REFORMATION IN POLAND.

The Reformation in Poland, although its influence on general European history in the period treated in this volume is comparatively slight, has some features of special interest. It pursued its course for nearly half-a-century without material hindrance either from the national government or the authorities of the Church. During this era its difficulties arose principally from the dissensions of the Reformers, from the independence of the nobility, the ignorance and apathy of the oppressed peasantry, and the want of sympathy between the country and the towns, where the German element was strong, and between the burghers and the nobles. Thus the evolution of a national Reformed Church was impossible; the Reform movement never obtained any vital hold on the mass of the people; and no united opposition could be offered to the forces of the Counter-Reformation, when at length they began to act. On the other hand the lack of organisation, of combination, and of national and ecclesiastical control, left the way free for the most hazardous and audacious speculations. Every man's intellect was a law to himself, and heresy assumed its most exorbitant forms.

The conditions of the Church in Poland called for reform not less than elsewhere. The Bishops were enormously wealthy; and the character of the episcopate was not likely to be improved by the measures of 1505, and 1523, which were intended to exclude all but nobles from the bishoprics. The right of the King to nominate to bishoprics was practically recognised. In 1459 a memorable attack was made upon the administration of the Polish Church by John Ostrorog, a man not only of the highest rank, but of great learning. His indictment, made before the Diet, foreshadows the general demand for a reform of the Church, though nothing is said about doctrine. The excessive authority of the Pope, the immunity of the clergy from public burdens and public control, the exactions of the Papacy, the expenses of litigation before the Curia, indulgences, simony, and the requirement of fees for spiritual offices, the unworthiness and ignorance of monks and clergy, the encouragement of idleness, are all put forward with no sparing hand. Owing to the privileges of the Polish nobility the power of the ecclesiastical Courts was less in Poland than elsewhere, and excommunication was openly set at defiance. On the side of doctrine Hussite influence,

continually spreading in Poland during the fifteenth century, prepared the ground; and the fact that nearly a half of the subjects of the Polish Crown, the Slavonic population of the South and East, professed the faith of the Greek Church, familiarised the Jagellon Kings with divergences in faith, and the people with the existence of other beliefs.

It was not long before the movement initiated by Luther spread to Poland, and it appeared first in Polish Prussia, the western part of the territory of the Teutonic Order, ceded by it in 1466 to King Casimir III. Danzig was the first centre of an active propaganda, and the urban population favoured the new opinions. The ecclesiastical authorities endeavoured to act with firmness, but found their authority insufficient. In 1525 the Reformers captured the town government, and the Reformation was set on foot. But in the following year Sigismund I, then King of Poland and Grand Duke of Lithuania, took forcible measures to suppress the Reform. In this, almost the only energetic step taken by that King against the spread of Reform, he was actuated by political motives. In 1523 Albert of Brandenburg, the last Grand Master of the Teutonic Order, had adopted the Reform, and in 1525 he converted the dominions entrusted to his charge into a hereditary dukedom; and Sigismund feared that the Reforming tendencies of West Prussia might lead the inhabitants into closer political relations with the emancipated master of East Prussia. In spite, however, of Sigismund's temporary success at Danzig, Lutheran opinions continued to spread, and finally triumphed in Polish Prussia.

In Poland itself frequent acts against the new opinions were passed by ecclesiastical synods, in 1527, 1530, 1532, 1542, and 1544. But the Church was powerless in face of the famous Polish privilege, "*neminem captivare nisi jure victum*," and the other immunities of the nobles. The ecclesiastical Courts were regarded with general contempt. The hostility of the Diets was undisguised. In 1538 they forbade the Polish clergy to receive any preferment from the Pope, in 1543 they abolished annates, and in 1544 they subjected the clergy to ordinary taxation. Sigismund I issued an order in 1534 forbidding Polish students to study at foreign universities, but this order was cancelled in 1543; and the inaction of Sigismund proclaims either his impotence or his lack of zeal. His son, Sigismund II Augustus, who succeeded in 1548, was probably rather friendly than indifferent. In any case the power of the King was little; and individual nobles took what line they pleased without reference to King or Church.

In these circumstances not only did Lutheran views spread freely, but other heresies appeared. A society was formed at Cracow, under the influence of Francisco Lismanini, which not only ventilated the opinions of the more orthodox Reformers, but also cast doubt upon the doctrine of the Trinity. In 1548 the Reformation in Poland received a great impulse by the expulsion from Bohemia of the Bohemian Brethren,

a sect which received a definite organisation about 1456, and had survived through many vicissitudes, preserving many of the more advanced Hussite opinions. Luther, at first hostile to their views, afterwards became reconciled, and established a spiritual communion with them. Ferdinand, after other repressive measures had failed, expelled them from his territories; and on their way towards Prussia they found temporary hospitality in Posen, where they were entertained by Andreas Gorka, the Castellan of Posen. The Bishop of Posen, however, before long procured their expulsion; they passed into Prussia, leaving behind, however, many converts; and their congregations afterwards evangelised many districts of Posen and of Great Poland.

The reign of Sigismund Augustus (1548–72) saw the Polish Reformation at its height. The Synod of Piotrkow in 1552, at which Stanislaus Hosius, the Bishop of Ermland, first took a prominent part as a defender of the Church, initiated a vigorous campaign against the Reform; but although the clergy procured the martyrdom of a poor priest, they found themselves helpless against the nobles. The Diet of 1552 left to the clergy the power of judging heresy, but deprived them of the authority to inflict any civil or political penalty. In the same year a Polish Reformer, Modrzewski, laid before the King a remarkable and moderate scheme of national ecclesiastical reform; but there was no authority capable of carrying it out. In 1556 licence assumed the form of law, and the principle of *cujus regio* was carried to its extreme consequence, when the Diet enacted that every nobleman could introduce into his own house any form of worship at his pleasure, provided that it was in conformity with the Scriptures. The King at this time also demanded from Pope Paul IV in the name of the Diet the concession of mass in the vernacular, communion in both kinds, the marriage of priests, the abolition of annates, and a National Council for Reform and the union of sects. He received in the following year a stinging reprimand from the fiery Pontiff for an offence in which he was little more than a passive agent.

The Reformation seemed to be triumphant. But excessive liberty was a source of weakness. The Bohemian brethren, indeed, formed a durable union with the Genevan Churches in Poland in 1555. The former were most powerful in Posen and Great Poland, the latter in Little Poland and Lithuania. But the Lutherans were a persistent obstacle to union. It was hoped that the return of John Laski (à Lasco) to his native land in 1556 might put an end to divisions. This member of a noble Polish house had listened to the voice of Zwingli and Erasmus in his youth, and afterwards had renounced his prospects of high preferment in his own Church in order to preach reform. His self-denying labours in East Friesland had been crowned with success, and as head of the community of foreign Reformers in London he had won a reputation beyond the Channel. His gentle nature, and the moderate character

of his opinions, which, although they were nearest to those of Calvin and Zwingli, were calculated to give the least possible offence to the Lutherans, raised great hopes of him as a mediator. But he died in 1560, having effected nothing.

Protestant dissensions continued, and the Protestant cause was further discredited by the activity of the anti-Trinitarians. Lismanini had openly denied the Trinity, and Bernardino Ochino in 1564 found many hearers. He was expelled, however, very shortly. The Unitarians had their centre at Pinczow, near Cracow, and among their leaders were first Stancari and Lismanini, and afterwards Georgio Biandrata, and Peter Gonesius, a Pole. Even in the face of this double danger, from their own advanced wing and from the Catholic side, the Protestants failed to achieve unity. At length at the synod of Sandomir, 1570, mutual toleration rather than union was arranged between the Lutherans on the one hand, and the united Church of Genevans and Bohemians on the other. Thus the critical time of the death of Sigismund Augustus in 1572 found the Protestant sects widely spread in the Polish dominions, enjoying virtual toleration, but probably not very deeply rooted in the Polish people, compromised by advanced freethinkers, and barely concealing their mutual antagonism.

Meanwhile dangers were arising. The direct efforts of Stanislaus Hosius, the mission of Lippomani in 1555, and that of Commendoni in 1563, did little to check the Reformed opinions. But from the introduction of the Jesuits into Poland at the suggestion of Cardinal Hosius in 1564, and from the transfer into their hands of the institutions of higher education founded by him in Poland, dates the beginning of a more insidious and effective opposition, which was destined in a period beyond our present scope to attain complete success.

This brief note may serve to show the position of the new religions in Poland down to the death of Sigismund Augustus. But the name of Socinus is so closely linked with the religious history of that country and with that of the *dissidentes de religione* (the appellation given in Poland in 1573 to the adherents of the Reformation, though afterwards extended in its significance), that a word must be said about the two well-known teachers of that name. Lelio Sozzini was a native of Siena, born in 1525. Attracted early by the writings of Luther, he made himself suspected at home, and travelled widely throughout Europe, coming into contact with all the leading Reformers. He visited Poland twice, and doubtless found kindred spirits there; he probably influenced Lismanini; but although the audacity of his opinions and the free expression of his doubts seem to have caused him to be regarded with suspicion by more orthodox Reformers, he does not appear to have actually denied the doctrine of the Trinity. He died in 1562. His nephew, Fausto Sozzini, passed the line. He also was born at Siena in 1539. He came to Poland in 1579, after the anti-Trinitarian

opinions had long been developed there. Under the protection of the Transylvanian Prince, Stephen Báthory, the sect had flourished, and had acquired in the town of Racow its own school, church, and printing-press. Sozzini speedily won great influence, and was able to influence the doctrines of the Unitarians. Eventually the sect received his name, and was known as Socinian.

The distinctive doctrine of the Socinians was the denial of the doctrine of the Trinity, the teaching of One God. They recognised divinity in the Father alone, and denied it to the Son and the Holy Ghost. They reverenced Christ as the Messiah, as a teacher and a reformer, but as a human being. They believed nevertheless in His supernatural birth, in His miracles, His resurrection, His ascension. They believed that He received revelations from the Father. They followed also the Bible as their guide and standard; giving it their own interpretation, which differed from that of the Protestants and of the Fathers of Nicaea. They rejected the Augustinian doctrine of original sin, and believed that salvation was to be obtained by conscientious following of Christ's teaching, and virtuous living. They rejected therefore also the doctrine of the Atonement. Baptism was for them only the symbol of admission into the Christian communion, and the Lord's Supper a mere memorial. This remarkable sect had its origin in the active brains of speculative Italians, its favourable ground for growth in the religious liberty or anarchy of Poland, but it received its definite organisation, its tenets, and its name from Fausto Sozzini.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE CHURCH AND REFORM.

The necessity of reform and of a spiritual regeneration of Catholicism had been acknowledged again and again at the opening of the sixteenth century by men of high position in the Church. Time after time it was admitted by the Sacred College, and at each Conclave the whole body of Cardinals pledged themselves to reform. Commissions were appointed but nothing came of them; and the Fifth Lateran Council (1512–17), instead of reforming the evils that had resulted from excessive centralisation, did little more than lay down the "*plenitudo potestatis*" of the papal monarchy with an insistency that had hitherto found expression only in the pages of curialist writers.

The vested interests of the officials of the Roman Court were in fact too strong for the forces working for reform; and the measures which might have obviated the schism and nipped the revolution in the bud were not taken until it was too late. The opponents of reform had the strength of a group of men working together with a definite knowledge of what they wanted to defend. The Catholic reformers on the other hand were scattered, voices in the desert, with no means of common action. Nor, when opportunities occurred to them, were they for long agreed as to the particular lines reform should take. The seeds of the later divisions among the Catholic reformers existed from the very first, and the course of events soon led to those differences becoming acute. For men desired reform from very different motives. The ascetic temperament saw nothing but the moral abuses and the corruption of the clergy; the humanist desired a greater freedom of thought, and a certain toleration of divergences of opinion which was abhorrent to the doctrinal reformer. The latter shared with the humanist the wish for a reconstruction of the traditional dogma, but wished to see the line between orthodoxy and heterodoxy drawn with no uncertain hand. Ultimately, two great parties evolved themselves among the Catholic reformers: the one desired conciliation and the discovery of a common ground on which the old and the new ideas might be harmonised; the other, while sharing with the former party its indignation at the moral corruption of

the Church, yet parted company with it with regard to the reform of doctrine. The supremacy of St Thomas and of the great scholastics must be preserved, and the whole body of dogma which the Middle Ages had evolved must be retained. Concession of any kind was not to be heard of; and this party believed that a further increase of the powers of the Papacy and of the centralisation of authority was the surest safeguard of the Church. The former party wished for a real Catholic reformation; the latter succeeded in reducing a movement which started with so great a promise to little more than a counter-reformation. It will be our purpose in this chapter to sketch the steps by which this was brought about, and all real reform, such as might have conciliated nascent Protestantism and preserved the unity of the Western Church, was made impossible.

The aspirations of scattered individuals for reform first found a nucleus and an organisation in the "Oratory of Divine Love," founded at Rome towards the end of the Pontificate of Leo X. This famous society numbered among its members some of the most learned prelates and upright laymen who were connected with the Court of Rome in that day. They met for prayer and meditation in the little church of Santi Silvestro e Dorotea in Trastevere and discussed means for the purification of the Church. Almost every tendency of thought and temperament among the Catholic reformers was to be found there. Caraffa and Sadoleto, Gaetano da Thiene and Giberti were alike members. The ascetic and the humanist, the practical and the doctrinal reformer met together and worked in harmony. Their numbers were some fifty or sixty in all. In the last years of the Pagan Renaissance, when its weaker elements were coming to the surface, and when decadence rather than a new interest in life was becoming its keynote, there was thus growing in numbers and influence a party full of promise for the future history of the Church. A stern and almost Puritan moral ideal was combined with a belief that there was no essential antagonism between faith and culture, between profane learning and Christian knowledge. As the great medieval theologians and scholastics had interpreted Christianity to their age, and had harmonised the divergent elements in the knowledge of their time, so now in the Oratory of Divine Love the feeling found expression that the work had to be done afresh, and that the new revelation given to men by the Renaissance must be incorporated into the system of Christian thought.

Nor was it only the desire for a closer alliance between Christianity and humanism which bound many of these men together. Augustine had always been a force in the medieval Church, and the Augustinian elements in its theology were ever again asserting themselves and claiming supremacy. The attraction of Augustine felt so strongly by Luther was not felt only by him. The end of the fifteenth and the beginning of

the sixteenth centuries were marked by a renewed study of St Augustine in many quarters, and by a consequent revival of the Pauline ideas of Justification in different forms. As Reginald Pole said in one of his letters, the jewel which the Church had so long kept half concealed was again brought to light. This trend of thought found expression in the writings of Thomas de Vio, Cardinal Cajetan, and for some time was looked on with favour in the highest quarters of the Church. That section of the Oratory of Divine Love which wished to spiritualise theology and to deepen the bases of the Christian life found ample support in the accepted theology of the day.

Venice was the home from which came many of the thinkers of this type in the Oratory of Divine Love. After the Sack of Rome in 1527 its members were scattered; but in a short time many of them met again at Venice, where they found new recruits. The Senator Gasparo Contarini and Gregorio Cortese, Abbot of San Georgio Maggiore, were the most influential of the new members. Giberti had become Bishop of Verona in 1524, and his household became a new centre for the reforming movement. His administration of his diocese set an example to other prelates; and his reform of his clergy served in many ways as a model to the Fathers at Trent, though he himself did not live to take any active part in that assembly. At Padua Reginald Pole spent many years, and though he was only a layman his manner of life and conduct of his household were not unworthy to be compared with those of Giberti. The University of Padua numbered then among its teachers some of the most eminent scholars of the day, and it was one of the centres of the Christian Renaissance. Modena also was one of the strongholds of the Catholic reformers; Giovanni Morone, who afterwards with difficulty escaped the charge of heresy, was its Bishop. Sadoleto, Bishop of Carpentras, Gregorio Cortese, and other leaders of the movement either were Modenese or had been connected with Modena. The union of scholarship and holiness of life with zeal for practical reform, as exemplified in these men, is rare in the history of the Church.

The movement for reform from within thus inaugurated in Italy did not become a power in official circles in Rome until the pontificate of Paul III. The paper reforms of the Fifth Lateran remained a dead letter, while the good intentions of Adrian VI came to nothing. His reign, nevertheless, will ever be memorable from his confession that the source of the poison which was corrupting the whole Church was in the papal Court, nay even in the Pontiffs themselves. Ignorant of the world, ignorant of the forces at work in Rome itself, Adrian was helpless. If he had had any measure of success, his reforms would have been of a moral and practical kind alone. Having lived most of his life in cloisters, he knew little of the change that had come over human thought. St Thomas was his master, and he did not wish to go beyond the work of the greatest of medieval thinkers. Adrian was a precursor of Caraffa

and the later Counter-Reformation, rather than of the peace-loving Contarini and the learned Giberti.

Clement VII, of the House of Medici, was well-meaning and wished to remove the worst abuses in the Church. The hell through which the Papacy passed during his pontificate was indeed paved with good intentions, but they all came to nothing. The cares of the temporal power and the interests of his family left little time for the reformation of society. Still in 1524 the Roman Congregation was set up to reform the clergy; but in the troublous years which followed, leading up to the Sack of Rome, little could be done. Giberti, who with Nicholas Schomberg, the Cardinal of Capua, appears to have influenced Clement's policy in those early years of his reign, had little time to spare from secular affairs; and it was not until he finally retired to his Bishopric of Verona that he obtained an opportunity of playing the part of a reformer. Thus, while the Teutonic lands were rapidly falling away from the Church, nothing was done in Rome itself to heal the abuses which all men acknowledged to be crying for reform.

There was one remedy for the Church's evils which was a nightmare to Clement. A reform of the Church by a free General Council was a cry which grew in intensity and sprang up from many quarters as Clement's vacillating reign dragged on its way. Luther had appealed from the Pope to a free General Council; and the appeal was echoed in the German Diets. Charles himself took up the idea; but, as it soon came to be seen that what Charles meant by a General Council was very different from that desired by the Protestants, the enthusiasm for it soon cooled down in Germany; and the idea of a National Council for the settlement of the affairs of religion took its place. At times, when it was a useful weapon to be used against the Pope, Charles also gave the idea of a National Council his support; but he sincerely desired the convocation of an Ecumenical Council, and he fell back on the alternative only when the conduct of the Papacy forced his hands. General Councils had ominous memories for the Papacy since the days of Pisa, Constance, and Basel; and Clement no doubt felt that the government of the Church during his pontificate would not stand the ordeal of a public examination. General Councils were apt to get out of hand, and no one could foresee whither they might ultimately lead. Clement succeeded in putting off the evil day at the price of letting events in Germany take their own course.

With Clement's successor, Alessandro Farnese, who took the title of Paul III (1534), a new era began; and at last the party of Catholic reformers found their opportunity. One of the first acts of the new Pope was to confer a Cardinal's hat upon Gasparo Contarini; and soon after Caraffa, Sadoleto, and Pole also received the sacred purple. The leaders among the Catholic reformers were summoned to Rome. On January 30, 1536, a Bull was read in the Consistory for the reform of many of the

papal offices, but it was not published; and in the summer of the same year Paul appointed a commission of nine to report on the reforms that were needful. The nine members of the commission were Contarini, Caraffa, Sadoleto, Giberti, Pole, Aleander, Federigo Fregoso, Gregorio Cortese, and the Master of the Sacred Palace, Tommaso Badia. Their report presented in 1537 is the well-known *Consilium delectorum cardinalium et aliorum praelatorum de emendanda ecclesia.* The great principle to which they return again and again is that laws ought not to be dispensed with save for grave cause, and that even then no money should be taken for dispensation. To the system of money payments they trace the chief evils of the Roman Court. Everything could be obtained for money, however hurtful it might be to the general welfare of the Church. The report does not confine itself to the evils at the fountain-head. The whole Church was infected with corruption. Unfit persons were habitually ordained and admitted to benefices. Pensions and charges were imposed upon the revenues of benefices which made it impossible for the holder to live an honest life. Expectatives and reservations had a demoralising effect. Residence was generally neglected by the Bishops and clergy; and exemptions from the authority of the Ordinary enabled leaders of scandalous lives to persist in their wickedness. The regular clergy were no better than the seculars. Scandals were frequent in the religious Houses; and the privileges of the Orders enabled unfit persons to hear confessions. The Cardinals were as bad as the Bishops with regard to residence, and accumulated offices in their persons. Indulgences were excessive in number, and superstitious practices were too often encouraged. Much evil had followed from the granting of marriage dispensations; and absolutions for the sin of simony could be obtained for a mere song. In Rome itself the services were slovenly conducted and the whole priesthood was sordid. Loose women were openly received even in the houses of Cardinals. Unbelief grew apace, and unnecessary disputations on trivial points disturbed the faith of the vulgar. It was the duty of the Mother and Mistress of all Churches to lead the way in the amending of these evils.

Simultaneously with the appointment of this remarkable commission for reform Paul III published a Bull (May 29, 1536), summoning a General Council to meet at Mantua in May, 1537; and a Bull of Reformation was published in September, 1536. But the renewal of war prevented the Council from assembling, and its meeting was deferred. Meanwhile little was done to carry out the proposals of the reform commission. It was decided on the suggestion of the Cardinal of Capua, Nicholas Schomberg, not to publish the report, as it revealed so many grave scandals in connexion with the Holy See. The document was however privately printed in Rome, and by some means a copy reached Germany. It was republished there with scoffing comments. This incident shows that there was little chance of any

papal attempts at reform being regarded in Germany as seriously intended. A beginning was indeed made at Rome. The offices of the Datary, the Chancery, and the Penitentiary were overhauled: and a report signed by Contarini, Caraffa, Aleander, and Badia—the "*Consilium quattuor delectorum a Paulo III super Reformatione sanctae Romanae Ecclesiae*"—was in the autumn of 1537 presented to the Pope.

But in reality little seems to have been done. The General Council never met at Mantua. The Duke did not desire its presence in his territory, and the war between Charles and Francis made it practically impossible. The Council was then summoned to meet at Vicenza on May 1, 1538, but it again had to be postponed. It soon became clear that the Pope's zeal for reform was rapidly waning. Contarini did his best to stir him up to action. In his "*Epistola de potestate Pontificis in usu clavium*" and in his "*De potestate Pontificis in compositionibus*" he emphasised the propositions that the Papacy was a sacred charge, and that its powers were to be used for the good of the Church and not to its destruction. In all Contarini's writings the conception of the Papacy as a monarchy and not a tyranny appears. It is a monarchy over freemen, and its powers are to be used according to the light of reason. Though the Catholic reformers held strongly to the divine mission of the Papacy in the Church, they distinguished carefully between the legitimate and the illegitimate exercise of its authority. Freely the Papacy had received, freely it should give. The whole official system of the Curia with its fees and extortions had become a scandal. An iniquitous traffic in sacred things had grown up. Contarini appealed to the Pope to root out effectively this canker, which was destroying the spiritual life of the Church. In November, 1538, Contarini travelled with Paul III to Ostia, and they discussed his writings. "Our good old man," as Contarini calls him in a letter to Pole, made him sit by his side, and talked with him about the reform of the *compositiones*. The Pope informed him that he had read his treatise, and spoke to him with such Christian feeling that his hopes were thus awakened anew at the moment when he was about to give way to despair.

Sarpi doubts the sincerity of Paul III with regard to reform. He believes that the Pope took up various projects of reform merely as an excuse to prove that a Council was unnecessary. But Sarpi's prejudice always blinds him to any good action on the part of a Pope; and there is little doubt that Paul was in earnest in wishing to remove the graver abuses of the papal Court. But he was an old man when he ascended the papal throne, and his energy did not increase with years; moreover, he was not a zealot, possessed with one overmastering idea. The interests of his family, his own personal comfort, and the dignity of the Holy See, were to him things that were not to be lightly risked in the carrying out of any scheme of reform.

Nothing came immediately of his talk with Contarini in the autumn of 1538; but in the spring of 1540 a fresh, and, as it appeared, a more energetic beginning of reform was made in Rome. In April Giberti was summoned from his diocese to give the Sacred College the benefit of his experience; and commissions were appointed for carrying out reforms in the Apostolic Chamber, the Rota, the Chancery, and the Penitentiary. The hopes with which the pontificate had begun were fully revived. Giovanni Morone, the papal Nuncio in Germany, had again and again in his letters pressed upon the Pope the necessity of a Council and of energetic measures of reform, if the Church was to be saved in Germany. Morone's instructions ordered him to be as conciliatory as possible; and it seemed that moderate men on both sides might arrange an understanding. The proposal of Faber, the Bishop of Vienna, to condemn as heretical a series of propositions selected from Lutheran writers, was disapproved of by the Pope. The failure so far of the attempts to assemble a General Council made Charles fall back on a series of national conferences, in which endeavours were made to find some common terms of agreement that might serve as a basis for the action of the Ecumenical Council when it should meet.

It was in pursuance of this policy that the famous Religious Colloquy took place at Ratisbon in April, 1541, after preliminary meetings at Hagenau (June, 1540) and at Worms (November, 1540). The detailed story of the negotiations belongs to the history of Germany; but the discussions which took place are of interest to us as showing the extent of the reconstruction of the Church system to which the most liberal of the Catholic reformers were prepared to consent. Agreement was arrived at on the fundamental articles of Original Sin, Free Will, and Justification. With regard to the last, a neutral formula was arrived at midway between the Lutheran doctrine and that formulated later at Trent. Justification was two-fold, and depended both on "inherent" and on "imputed" righteousness. It was attained by faith; but that faith must be living and active. The marriage of priests might be permitted but not encouraged, as also communion in both kinds. On the general doctrine of the Sacraments, and especially on the doctrine of the Eucharist, agreement was found more difficult; and when the papal prerogatives came on for discussion a clear divergence of opinion showed itself. It was clear that, after concessions on both sides, a considerable gulf still remained between them. Moreover, even if the peacemakers could come to terms, there were still Luther and the Pope to reckon with. Luther was suspicious, even unduly suspicious, of all papal advances; and he refused to believe in the sincerity of proposals in which his old adversary Eck had a share. The Pope, on the other hand, unhesitatingly rejected any ambiguous definition of the papal prerogative and of the doctrine of the Sacraments; and the agreement on Justification was viewed with suspicion in Rome, and only tolerated

after much explanation. It was clear that no final settlement could be carried at the conference, which was accordingly brought to an end by the Emperor at the beginning of June, 1541.

Something at any rate had been gained, and the beginnings of a peaceful solution had been made. That complete success should have been attained at Ratisbon was probably impossible from the first. The exigencies of the political situation at the time made it the interest of the enemies of Charles to prevent a settlement of the religious difficulties, which it was feared would strengthen his hands. Moreover it was clear that the Catholic reformers were no longer as united as they had been; and their influence over the Pope was evidently lessening. Caraffa was drifting apart from his colleagues, and was rapidly becoming the leader of a party whose spirit was very different from that of the gracious idealists with whom he had been associated. The future of Catholicism lay in the balance; and the next few years would determine for centuries the attitude of the Roman Church towards the modern world, its politics, and its thought. It may be that when the Colloquy of Ratisbon took place it was already too late to save the unity of the Church in Germany. But to contemporaries even that did not seem quite hopeless. It was difficult for men living in the midst of the drama to realise how far the world had moved from its old orbit and how few of the old landmarks remained. To declare dogmatically, however, that the attempt at compromise made at Ratisbon was doomed to failure from the first is to assume that Protestantism and Catholicism had already taken up the definite positions which they reached at the end of the century. In the case of Catholicism, however, it was only after a struggle, the issue of which was long doubtful, that its attitude was definitely determined.

The revival of religious life combined with a strict adherence to the old scholastic dogma—the feeling, as Carnesecchi put it, that men had the Catholic religion, and only desired that it should be better preached—revealed itself first in an awakening of the old religious Orders and the formation of others to meet new needs. The numerous exemptions from episcopal jurisdiction possessed by the old Orders had given rise to many grave abuses, and contributed to the slackening of their spiritual life. Spain, the home of religious orthodoxy united with religious zeal, led the way in reform. The achievement of national unity at the end of the fifteenth century brought with it a revival of the Spanish Church. The State used the Church for its own purposes, and the royal authority became all powerful. The Spanish hierarchy, though always fervently Catholic, was never ultramontane. Papal interference was carefully limited; and, with the aid of the revived Inquisition, Ximenes reformed the Spanish Church. The religious Orders were brought under control, and the morals of the Spanish clergy soon compared favourably with those

of the rest of Christendom. A revival of Scholasticism in its Thomist form took place, of which the great Dominican Melchior Cano became later the chief exponent. Stress was laid upon the divine right of the episcopate. Bishops were not merely curates of the Pope. The nobler sides of medieval Christianity were again displayed to the world by the Spanish Church. The darker side, the horrors of the Inquisition, the intellectual intolerance and narrow outlook on life, the deficient sense of human freedom and the rights of conscience, were there also; but in a narrower sphere the seeds were being sown of one of the greatest religious revivals the world has seen. The line which events took in Spain could not fail in time to react upon the Catholic reform movement in Italy; and that reaction became more and more powerful. The inspiration of the movement in Italy was at first indigenous, but in time the gloomy fanaticism of Spain overshadowed it and crushed out its more humane elements

But in its beginnings the movement was a spontaneous expression of the single desire to make the Catholic religion once more a reality. With many it took the form of a restoration of the primitive austerity of the older Orders. Gregorio Cortese recalled to its ideal the Italian Benedictine Congregation, reorganised in 1504, and impressed upon it its duty of supporting the Church by its learning The Camaldolese, an offshoot of the Benedictines founded by St Romuald in the eleventh century, were reformed by Paolo Giustiniani, a member of a noble Venetian family. A number of these monks under his direction led an ascetic life at Massaccio, between Ancona and Camerino. After his death in 1528 Monte Corone, became the centre of the new Congregation; and the Order spread rapidly throughout Southern Europe. The old monastic Orders, however, only set an example which, powerful for good though it was, went but a little way in restoring Catholicism among the people. It was reserved for the Franciscans and for new religious societies to bring about a revival of popular religion. In 1526 Matteo de' Bassi was authorised by Clement VII to found a reformed branch of Franciscans, pledged to revive the simple rule of their founder. They came to be known as Capuchins from their garb. Simple and superstitious, they appealed to the populace; and they became the spiritual guides and counsellors of the people. Religion was vulgarised in their hands, and their influence was not altogether for good. Some of them embraced Protestant ideas; and for a time the Order was viewed with some suspicion. But to the Capuchins more than perhaps to any other organisation does the Roman Church owe the preservation of the mass of the Italian people in her fold.

The older Orders of monks and friars were, however, unequal by themselves to achieving the regeneration of Catholicism. The secular clergy in many parts had fallen into a lower state of degradation than the regulars; and it was one of the chief concerns of the Oratory of Divine Love to

bring the parish priests to a sense of their high calling. Two of the members of the Oratory, Gaetano da Thiene and Giovanni Pietro Caraffa, took the first active steps to effect this reformation. Gaetano da Thiene, of an ancient family of Vicenza, was one of the *pronotari participanti* at the papal Court under Julius II. The life, however, became distasteful to him, and he accordingly resigned his post and took orders. He was one of the earliest members of the Oratory. After a short time he left Rome and worked in Vicenza and Venice, preaching to the people and doing good works. His experience there taught him that the weakness of the Church was largely due to the inefficiency and corruption of the parochial clergy. Accordingly, in 1523, he returned to Rome with the idea of founding a society to remedy this evil. There he again met Caraffa, who at once fell in with his views; and the two worked together to achieve this end. The Canons Regular of St Augustine may have suggested to Gaetano da Thiene the Order which they obtained the permission of Clement VII to found in 1524.

The new society was to consist of ordinary secular clergy bound together by the three monastic vows. They were to be, in short, secular priests with the vows of monks. The reformation of the clergy and a life of contemplation were to be the objects of the society.

The new society is important, not so much on account of its own work among the secular clergy as for the example it set. It always remained small in numbers, and its membership came to be confined to the nobility. Though the original conception was due to Gaetano da Thiene, yet it was from Caraffa that the society took its name. It became known as the Order of Theatines after his see of Chieti (Theate). It was no doubt largely due to his administrative ability and power of organisation that the society was a success. It found many imitators. A similar society of regular clerks was founded at Somasca in the Milanese, 1528, by Girolamo Miani, son of a Venetian senator; and at Milan the Order of Barnabites was established about 1530 by three noble ecclesiastics, Zaccaria, Ferrari, and Morigia. The Barnabites were extremely successful in their labours; and their society carried into practice far and wide the scheme which Gaetano da Thiene had been the first to conceive for the improvement of the secular clergy.

Quietly and unostentatiously, with little active assistance from the papal Court, the regeneration of Catholicism in Italy was thus begun. Caraffa was the guiding genius in the work, so far as a movement which was so wide can be connected with a single man; and it was pregnant with importance for the future that he was growing more and more estranged from the liberal Catholic reformers, with whom he had at one time worked in the Oratory of Divine Love. The path which Contarini and his friends were indicating, greater freedom in discipline, reduction of papal prerogative, and a considerable restatement of the

traditional dogma, meant a break with the past which, when its full import dawned upon them, shocked Caraffa and those who clung to medieval Christianity. The Ratisbon proposals of 1541 opened their eyes, and the parting of the ways came. The group of Catholic reformers split in two, and the division paralysed for a time the work which had been begun with the *Consilium de emendanda ecclesia.* Until it was clear that a reform of morals would not entail any surrender of medieval theology and of the medieval system of Church government, Caraffa and his friends made impossible any general scheme of reform. The new Orders, the Theatines, the Barnabites, and the Capuchins, were restoring Catholicism rapidly on the old lines. Their work went steadily on, and meanwhile it was enough to wait. They were doing the work as Caraffa, and not as Contarini, wanted it to be done. The progress made, however, was not as rapid as might have been wished, until two agencies appeared upon the scene which became the most potent of the forces that regenerated Catholicism, and breathed into it a militant spirit, making all conciliation impossible. The Inquisition—the Holy Office for the Universal Church—and the Society of Jesus were the new organisations which achieved the work.

The Inquisition which was set up in Rome in 1542 by the Bull *Licet initio* was not new, but the adaptation of an old organisation to the changed conditions of the times. The tendency to persecute appeared in the Church in very early days, but its lawfulness was always challenged; and it was not until the eleventh and twelfth centuries that any deliberate attempt was made to persecute systematically. A wave of heresy then passed over western Europe. Dualism and Manichaeism, always prevalent in the East, obtained a firm footing in the West; and the south of France became their stronghold. The Church became alarmed at the spread of ideas which not only were subversive of Christian faith but threatened the foundations of society and morals. The crusading spirit was diverted from the infidel to the heretic. The Albigensian crusade achieved its purpose. But something more was needed than an occasional holy war upon heresy. The work was taken in hand at first by the new episcopal Courts, which were beginning to administer the recently codified Canon Law in every diocese. But their action was spasmodic; and in the thirteenth century their efforts were reinforced by a papal Inquisition entrusted to the Dominican and Franciscan Orders. It was regulated by the papal Legates and its authority was enforced by provincial Councils. The Papacy however never had complete control of it; and side by side with it the old episcopal Inquisition went on. The episcopate viewed the papal Inquisition with jealousy, and in the fourteenth century succeeded to some extent in limiting its powers. In the fifteenth century its work was done and its activity ceased. It had stamped out heresy in Central

Europe at an awful expenditure of human life and at the cost of a complete perversion of the spirit of Christianity.

At the moment however when it was about to disappear Spain asked for its introduction into that country. The problem of the Moors and the Jews prompted the request; and on November 1, 1477, Sixtus IV authorised Ferdinand and Isabella to set up the Inquisition in their States. The Papacy consented with reluctance; and both Sixtus IV and Innocent VIII reserved a right of appeal to the Holy See. But they were both obliged to give way; and by a brief of August 23, 1497, Alexander VI finally abandoned the claim.

The Spanish Inquisition thus, though founded by Rome, did not remain under its direct control. The Spanish monarchy was responsible for it and used it as an instrument of State, though at times the terrific engine which it had created got beyond its control. The thoroughness with which Torquemada did his work achieved its object; and when Ximenes became Chief Inquisitor in 1507 the fierceness of persecution to some extent relaxed. It was this third or Spanish form of the Inquisition the success of which suggested to Caraffa the setting up of an Inquisition in Rome to supervise the whole Church. The idea was warmly supported by Ignatius Loyola, and accordingly Paul III, by a Bull of July 21, 1542, set up the Holy Office of the Universal Church. Six Cardinals were appointed commissioners, and were given powers as Inquisitors in matters of faith on both sides of the Alps. The Papacy thus provided itself with a centralised machinery, which enabled it to supervise the measures taken for checking the spread of the new opinions. Pius IV and Pius V extended the powers of the Inquisition, and its organisation reached its most developed form under Sixtus V, who by the Bull *Immensa* remodelled it along with the other Roman congregations. The number of Cardinals composing it was increased to twelve; and there were in addition a Commissary, an Assessor, and a body of Consultors, who were chosen from among canonists and theologians. Besides these officials, there were numerous Qualificators who gave their opinion on questions submitted to them. There were also an advocate charged with the defence of accused persons, and other subordinates. The Roman Inquisition not only proceeded against any persons directly delated to it, but also heard appeals from the sentences of Courts of the Inquisition in other localities. Inquisitors were in addition sent by it to any place where they appeared to be needed.

Though the sphere of active work of the Roman Inquisition was confined to Italy, it achieved the purpose, not only of stamping out Protestantism in the peninsula, but of bringing back the old intolerant spirit into the government of the Church. Conciliation and confessions of failure could not go hand in hand with the Inquisition. The failure of Contarini at Ratisbon in 1541, followed by the establishment of the Inquisition in 1542, marks the active beginning of the Counter-Reformation

in its narrower sense. A restoration of Catholicism by violence and irresistible force was beginning, which was driving the party of conciliation from the field and rendering all their endeavours useless. The proposals of the peacemakers were belied by the actions of the Inquisition.

The Society of Jesus was the second of the two great organisations which rose up to save the tottering Church. What the papal Inquisition did for Italy the Society of Jesus did for the Catholic Church throughout the world. Where force could not be used, persuasion and the subtler forms of influence were possible; and in the Society of Jesus the most powerful missionary organisation the world has ever seen was placed at the disposal of the Papacy. With rapidity little short of marvellous the Society spread not only throughout Europe but to China and the Indies, and became one of the chief powers in the counsels of the Church. Jesuit Fathers moulded to a considerable extent the dogmatic decrees at Trent. The emergence of the Papacy from the ordeal of the Council, with its prerogative increased rather than diminished, was largely due to their efforts.

Don Inigo Lopez de Recalde, their founder, was born in 1491 at the castle of Loyola in Guipuzcoa. He served as a page at the Court of Ferdinand of Aragon, and his youth and early manhood were devoted to the profession of arms. A severe wound which he received at the siege of Pampeluna in 1521 lamed him for life. During a long and painful period of convalescence there fell into his hands several books dealing with the life of Christ and the heroic deeds of the Saints. So deep an impression was made upon his mind that he determined to devote himself entirely to the service of God and transfer his allegiance from an earthly to a heavenly army. Restored to health early in 1522, he set out as a knight errant of Christ and the Virgin. We hear of him first at Montserrat at a shrine of the Virgin famous throughout Spain. But his stay here was short, and we next find him at Manresa not far from Montserrat. At Manresa, according to the traditional story, Ignatius had his celebrated vision lasting for eight days, in which the plan of his society was revealed to him and the method which he worked out in his *Spiritual Exercises*. There is reason to believe, however, that the evolution of his great idea was a very gradual process, and that he owed more to others than his disciples have been usually willing to admit. At any rate we know for certain that he left Manresa early in 1523 as a pilgrim for the Holy Land. He had already conceived the idea of founding a great society for the service of the Church. But its exact nature was not yet at all clear in his mind. Ignatius had little knowledge of the great world and its needs. To a Spaniard war with the infidel was an obvious idea; and it is not surprising that the reconquest of Jerusalem should occur to him at the first as the most laudable object

for his society. His stay at Jerusalem was not, however, very successful. A reckless enthusiast might cause trouble amidst a Mohammadan population; and Ignatius was refused permission to remain in Jerusalem and returned to Venice in 1524.

But the long journey had left its mark on his mind. He perceived his ignorance of the world and his lack of education, and he determined to do his best to remedy these defects. From 1524 to 1528 he studied at the Universities of Barcelona, Alcalà, and Salamanca; and in 1528 he proceeded to the University of Paris. It has been suggested that fear of the Inquisition prompted him to this step; for twice, once at Alcalà and once at Salamanca, he had fallen under its suspicion and narrowly escaped condemnation. At Paris Ignatius proceeded more cautiously; and the seven years of his stay there mark the crisis of his life when the visionary and enthusiast developed into an organiser and leader of men. Patiently and quietly, accepting no rebuff, he gathered round him one by one a little band whom he had infected with his enthusiasm. Pierre Lefèvre, a Savoyard, was his first disciple. Through him he obtained an influence over Francis Xavier, the future Apostle of the Indies, though he was no easy conquest. Diego (Jacobus) Laynez and Alfonso Salmeron, both Spaniards, were the next converts; and Nicholas Bobadilla and Simon Rodriguez soon followed. On August 15, 1534, the seven of them heard mass and received the communion in the church at Montmartre and made a vow of poverty and chastity. They also solemnly bound themselves to go to Jerusalem for the glory of God when they had finished their courses at the University; but, if it was found impossible to do so within a year, they agreed to throw themselves at the feet of the Holy Father and place themselves absolutely at his disposal.

Accordingly in 1537 they left Paris and went to Venice with the object of reaching the Holy Land. On the eve of their leaving Paris Lefèvre had gained three fresh recruits, Claude le Jay, Jean Codure, and Pasquier-Brouet; when Ignatius, who had meanwhile visited Spain, rejoined his companions, the little band had thus increased to ten. They, however, found it impossible to proceed to Jerusalem in consequence of the war with the Turks, and therefore, in accordance with their vow, determined to offer their services to the Pope. It was at Venice that Caraffa and Ignatius met, and it is probable that it was Caraffa's influence which brought home to Ignatius that there was more important work for him and his disciples nearer home. The infidel was at the time less of a danger to the Church than the heretic; and, just as in the middle ages the transition from a crusade against the one to a crusade against the other was easy, so now it was not difficult to persuade Ignatius that his true mission was the extirpation of Protestantism and the expulsion of half-hearted brethren.

Caraffa would have wished Ignatius and his disciples to unite

themselves to his favourite Order of Theatines, but to this Ignatius would in no way consent. He felt his own peculiar mission vividly, and what were to be the characteristic features of his Institute were rapidly taking shape in his mind. Though displeased by the refusal of Ignatius to conform to his wishes, Caraffa none the less gave him every encouragement. Caraffa's later dislike of the Society when he was Pope was due to deeper causes than Ignatius' refusal to throw in his lot with him. The diplomatic skill which had marked Ignatius ever since he left Spain in 1528 displayed itself in the caution with which he approached the Holy See. Accompanied by Lefèvre and Laynez, he determined to visit Rome, leaving his other companions to carry on in northern Italy the work of preaching and teaching and the gathering of fresh disciples, which they had begun in Venice. He felt it was necessary to survey the ground at Rome before attempting to settle there. On his journey Ignatius had a vision in a little church not far from Rome, which shows that the worldly wisdom which he had acquired had not dimmed his sense of a divine mission. God appeared to him in this wayside sanctuary, and he heard a voice saying, "*Ego vobis Romae propitius ero.*"

It was October, 1539, when the three enthusiasts reached Rome. Reform was in the air; and, though, as we have seen, little was done to carry out the suggestions of the *Consilium de emendanda ecclesia*, yet Paul III was ready to give every encouragement to any scheme for the improvement of the Church which did not call for any great self-denial on the part of the Papacy itself. Ignatius and his companions were accordingly favourably received and authorised to preach a reform of manners in Rome. The door thus being opened, Ignatius felt that the time had come to summon his other disciples to join him. At Easter, 1538, the little band were again united; and the work which they had begun in northern Italy was extended to Rome. Contarini, as well as Caraffa, welcomed new allies and became their protector. It only remained for Ignatius and his friends to draw up a definite Rule and to obtain confirmation from the Pope.

A supplication was accordingly drawn up indicating the objects and constitution of their proposed Society. Their petition was referred to a committee of three Cardinals, with Guidiccioni at its head, who at first reported unfavourably on the scheme. The needs of the day required the reform or suppression of existing religious Orders rather than the creation of new. Ignatius was however not discouraged. He worked on; and at length on September 27, 1540, the opposition was overcome, and by the Bull *Regimini militantis ecclesiae* the Society of Jesus was founded. The Bull contained a recitation of the petition of Ignatius and his companions; and it is the only certain authority in our possession from which we can learn the nature of his plan in its early form. The first thing which strikes the reader is that, while the objects of the Society are clearly indicated, its constitution is only vaguely outlined.

Its members are to bear arms in the service of Christ and of the Roman Pontiff, His Vicar, to whom they are to take a special vow of obedience. They are to be the militia of the Holy See, devoting themselves to its service whenever it may direct. As preachers and directors of consciences they are to work for the propagation of the faith, and above all by means of the education of the young. They are to take the vows of poverty and chastity, and obedience to the General whom they set over themselves, in all things which concern the observance of their Rule.

The power granted to the General is unprecedented in its extent. The right of command belongs to him entirely. He is to decide for each his vocation and define his work. This is the only indication in the Bull of the elaborate hierarchy of degrees which appears in the later constitution of the Society. At the same time this apparently absolute power granted to the General is limited by the fact that in certain cases he is to take the advice of his council, which is to consist, in important matters, of the greater part of the Society, while in affairs of less moment those members who happen to be in his immediate neighbourhood alone need be consulted. Here, and in the insistence on a period of probation before admission to the Society, there is an apparent approximation to the constitutions of the older religious Orders, in which, however much stress might be laid on the duty of obedience to authority, that authority was always bound to act in a canonical and constitutional way. If then the scheme laid before Paul III contained the germ from which the matured constitution of the Society was to grow, yet there were also present in it elements which disguised the extent to which the Society was a new departure. The language of Ignatius' petition is not inconsistent in its main features with the future constitution of the Society, but it did not necessarily imply it. The unique nature of the new organisation was not fully realised by the officials of the Roman Court. The limitation of the number of members to sixty, which was inserted in the Bull, may however show that they did not intend it to grow to unmanageable size until its tendencies revealed themselves more clearly.

On April 4, 1541, six out of the original ten members of the Society, who were then in Rome—Ignatius, Laynez, Salmeron, Le Jay, Pasquier-Brouet, and Codure—met to elect their General. The four who were absent with the exception of Bobadilla had sent their votes in writing. Ignatius was unanimously elected. He, however, refused the honour; but he was again elected on April 7. At last on April 17 he gave way; and on April 22 he received the vows of his companions at the church of San Paolo *fuori le mura*. Thus began the generalate of Ignatius, which lasted until his death on July 31, 1556. The fame of the new Order soon spread throughout the Catholic world, and many fresh members were admitted to its ranks. A second Bull (*Injunctum nobis*) was obtained from Paul III, dated March 14, 1543, which repealed the

clause of the former Bull limiting the number of members to sixty. Meanwhile Ignatius continued to work at the Constitutions; and the experience which he gained during the first years of the Society's existence no doubt unconsciously modified his scheme for its government. The great increase in the number of members—an increase which he himself did not altogether welcome—with the consequent mixture of heterogeneous elements in the Society, made it advisable to strengthen the authority of the General and to weaken still further those checks on his power which appear in the petition of 1540. In no other way could the unity of action of the Society be preserved. Judging from the part played after the death of Ignatius by Laynez, it is extremely probable that this development was largely due to his influence.

However this may be, the change undoubtedly took place; and by a Bull of Paul III of October 18, 1549 (*Licet debitum pastoralis officii*), and by a Bull of Julius III of July 21, 1550 (*Exposcit pastoralis officii*), the power of the General's Council was still further limited and other changes were made in the original plan. It is clear from the language of both these Bulls that, though further drafts of the Constitutions had been laid before the Papal authorities, Ignatius had not yet reduced them to their final form. From the Bull of Julius III it is evident that the system of a series of degrees in the Society was already shaping itself, but that the government of the Society had not yet become the system of absolutism it afterwards became.

Julius III (1550–5) was kindly disposed towards Ignatius; and during his pontificate the *Collegium Romanum* and the *Collegium Germanicum* were set up in Rome, to both of which he granted an annual subsidy. His successor Marcellus II, the Cardinal of Santa Croce, had been one of the Legates at Trent. It was due to his influence that Laynez and Salmeron were present at the Council as the theologians of the Pope. With Marcellus the Counter-Reformation ascended the papal throne; and the Jesuits appeared about to become the predominant influence in the Roman Court. But he died three weeks after his election, and was succeeded by Caraffa, who took the title of Paul IV. The new Pope immediately displayed hostility to the Order. A domiciliary visit was paid to the Gesù and a search made for arms. Paul's hostility to Spain made him suspect a body which had such close relations with that country. He, however, employed Laynez in connexion with his schemes for reform; and it was only after the death of Ignatius that he interfered in the internal affairs of the Society.

Laynez was elected Vicar-General on August 3, 1556, to administer the affairs of the Society until the Congregation could assemble to elect a new General, and to approve the Constitutions which Ignatius had left. For various reasons the meeting of the General Congregation seems to have been delayed; and Laynez spent the time in preparing a final

edition of the Institute for submission for its approval. Dissensions meanwhile broke out; Laynez was accused of purposely deferring the meeting of the General Congregation in his own interests. Bobadilla, Rodriguez, and Pasquier-Brouet were the leaders of the opposition. They appealed to the Pope against the arbitrary conduct of the Vicar-General, and requested that the government of the Society during the interregnum might rest with the Council of the Society. The Pope then called upon Laynez to bring before him the Constitutions and rules of the Society. Cardinal Carpi was appointed to enquire into the matter. His report recommended the confirmation of Laynez as Vicar-General, but advised that in future he should be obliged to consult the Council. Laynez, however, managed to obtain from the Pope a second enquiry, which was conducted by Cardinal Ghislieri the future Pius V. It is not clear what the exact result of this second enquiry was, but Laynez skilfully managed to divide the opposition and paralyse its efforts. At length on June 19, 1558, the General Congregation met; and July 2 was appointed for the election of the new General. Twenty Fathers were present. Cardinal Pachecho superintended the election by order of the Pope, and Laynez was elected by thirteen votes out of twenty. The assembly then proceeded to approve the Constitutions in the form they were presented to it by Laynez.

Laynez had apparently won a great triumph. He had quelled the opposition to his authority. He had persuaded the assembly to accept the Latin version by Polanco of Ignatius' Institute, by which the absolute power of the General was secured. But he had reckoned without the Pope. When Paul IV heard that the General Congregation had confirmed the Constitutions of the Society without consulting him and were about to adjourn, he sent Cardinal Pachecho to demand the insertion of two alterations in the Rule. In the first place, the Jesuits were to be bound to recite the offices of the Church in choir as other religious Orders were bound to do; and in the second place, the office of General was to be for three years only and not for life. Paul IV evidently feared the power which the Constitutions of the Society would give to an able man to wield as he thought fit. The Society might become an *imperium in imperio*. The "black Pope" might become a dangerous power behind the throne. If we read the story in the light of the later history of the Society, this is not an improbable interpretation of the action of Paul IV.

Laynez saw there was nothing to do but submit. The General Congregation bowed to the wishes of the Holy Father and dispersed. The two alterations of the Rule were not incorporated in it, but are printed as an appendix to the edition published at Rome in December, 1558. Laynez could do nothing but wait for better times. They were not long in coming. On August 18, 1559, Paul IV died and was succeeded by Pius IV, who did not share his predecessor's dislike of the Order. Laynez.

seized a favourable opportunity of bringing before the Society the question whether a mere informal order of a Pope was binding on them; but they considered it better to bring the matter directly before Pius IV, who revoked the order of his predecessor so far as that was necessary. The Papacy thus gave way in its first struggle with the Society which was to be so often more a master than a servant.

It has been necessary to describe at considerable length the early history of the government of the Society, in order to show how gradually it revealed its true nature to the world, and that absolutism did not triumph without considerable opposition in the Society itself. The new institution, however, from its very beginning, was the expression of the principle of blind obedience to authority. Other Orders had inculcated it as a virtue; but none had provided so searching a discipline by which complete ascendancy could be attained over its disciples. Moreover its purpose was not merely to produce Christian humility and the spirit of self-denial in the individual. It was to make each member a ready instrument for the purposes of the Society in its warfare with the world. A practical object was always the end in view—the triumph of the Church over hostile forces, the conquest of the hosts of Satan whatever form they might assume. A perpetual warfare was to be waged, and success could only be obtained by faithful obedience to orders. The theory of this discipline is developed in the *Spiritual Exercises* of St Ignatius, a work of genius in devotional literature. Though it owes its form to a considerable extent to the *Exercitatorio de la vida espiritual* of Dom Garcia de Cisneros, the Benedictine Abbot of Montserrat, published in 1500, which Ignatius no doubt found in use at the convent at Montserrat during his stay there, and to the writings of mystics such as Gerard Zerbold of Zutphen and Mauburnus (Johannes Momboir), members of the Brotherhood of the Common Life, which he probably met with during his stay in Paris, yet it is no mere compilation. The spirit which breathes through its pages differs from that which distinguishes most mystical writings, in that the absorption of the soul in God is not to be the end of action but the source of inspiration for further work. The moral paralysis of pantheism, the danger of all mystics, is avoided. According to the plan of the work the meditations are divided into four main divisions or weeks. In the first period the course of the meditations is conducted so as to produce in the neophyte a kind of hypnotism, a passive state in which he will be ready to receive the impressions that it is desired to make upon him. In the second week the glories of the Heavenly King and the privileges of His service are set before the disciple. The armies of Christ and Satan are contrasted, and the demands that God makes upon men are set forth. The third and fourth weeks are devoted to meditation upon the sacred story, the life and passion of Christ, and the enormity of human sin; and finally the eternal joys of heaven are set before the disciple. To

gain them he must give up liberty and the freedom of thinking for himself. Absolute obedience to the bride of Christ, the Church, its doctrines and its life, is the only way of salvation.

Such was the ideal which Ignatius set before the world in the *Spiritual Exercises*; and its spirit was faithfully reproduced in his Society. The *Spiritual Exercises* became the Bible of the Order and moulded its religious life. The novice on admission was trained in its method. He lost his personality to find it again only in the Society. He himself was but raw material for the Society to mould as it would. All his faculties were to be developed, but the initiative was never left to him. The life of the Society was a life of mutual supervision and subordination. That there were diversities of gifts was fully recognised, but no man might be the judge of his own capabilities The Society, through its General and those appointed by him, apportioned to each his work. The novices were distinguished according as they were selected for the priesthood or for secular duties; while those whose vocation was not yet clear formed a separate class called "indifferents." After a novitiate of two years, promotion was given to the grade of "scholastics." Those who belonged to this class spent some five years in the study of arts, and then acted themselves as teachers of junior classes for a similar period. The study of theology followed for four or five years, and then admission might be given to the rank of spiritual coadjutors. Others however were confined to the rank of temporal coadjutors. They were employed in the service of the Society and ministered to its needs, and may be compared to the lay-brethren of other Orders. The great majority of members of the Society never passed beyond the rank of spiritual coadjutor. They took part in all the missionary work of the Society, in preaching and teaching. The heads of its Colleges and Residences were taken from this class, but they had no share in the government of the Society, which was confined to the "Professed of the Four Vows," who were the Society in the strictest sense of the word. Besides the three ordinary vows, they took one of special allegiance to the Pope, undertaking to go whithersoever he might order. The higher offices of the Society were confined to them. Their number was always small in comparison with the total membership of the Society; and at the death of Ignatius they only numbered thirty-five. There was also a small class called the "Professed of the Three Vows," which only differed from that of the spiritual coadjutors in that the vows were taken in a more solemn way. It was reserved for those who were admitted into the Society for exceptional purposes.

At the head of this elaborate hierarchy stood the General. His power was absolute so far as the ordinary affairs of the Society were concerned; but he could not alter its constitution except with the consent of the General Congregation. An intricate system of checks and counter-checks guarded against any part of the huge machine getting

beyond his control, a system to which to some extent he also was subject. Six assistants were appointed to keep a watch upon him, and the possibility of his deposition was provided for. Espionage and delation permeated the whole Society. Absolute as his authority was, the General felt that in the Society there was a great impersonal force behind him, which prevented him from departing from the spirit of the founder.

Admirably fitted as such an organisation was, with its combination of adaptability and stability, to carry on the work of the Society with the least possible friction, yet it was inevitable that the influx of able men into the Society should lead to a variety of ideas. The intended unity of thought as well as action could only be partially enforced, and the abler minds could not be made to think alike. A considerable Spanish opposition arose in the Society, which criticised what it thought to be certain evil tendencies in the body. Mariana wrote a work on the defects of the Order; and the theory of morals, which Pascal criticised, did not become prevalent in the Society without a struggle. But in its first and golden age such division as there was did not weaken to any appreciable extent its unity of action, and it offered an unbroken front to the enemies of the Church.

The spread of the Society's organisation and the ubiquity of its members in the first years of its existence were remarkable. The Latin countries, Italy, Spain, and Portugal, were soon covered with a network of its institutions; and Jesuit Fathers became an influence in the counsels of Princes. North of the Alps progress was less rapid. In Southern Germany and Austria a foothold was obtained; but it was not until after the final dissolution of the Council of Trent that much progress was made there. In France considerable opposition had to be overcome before the Society could obtain an entry at all; and its afterwards famous College of Clermont long lived a precarious existence. Candid critics in the Church were not wanting. Melchior Cano called the Jesuits the precursors of Antichrist; and St Carlo Borromeo in his later years viewed with suspicion the power and tendencies of the Society. Great as their importance became, almost immediately after their foundation, in the counsels of the Church, their missionary influence, at any rate outside the Latin countries, is commonly antedated. Their educational system, which was a great advance on anything which had gone before, was only gradually developed; and by means of it their greatest services to the Church were rendered. During the years in which the Council of Trent sat, and in those immediately preceding, it was the Inquisition which was the most potent weapon in the hands of the Papacy. The Jesuits rendered yeoman service at the Council itself, and their day came when it was brought to a successful conclusion.

Such were the forces at work in the Church when at length

circumstances allowed the long deferred Council to meet. The Christian Renaissance, with its ideal of the unity of faith and reason and its attempt to find a place within the Church for all that was best in the achievements of the human mind, its philosophy, its science, and its art was rapidly being eclipsed by a new spirit, which claimed for Church authority complete control, and gave little scope to human freedom and self-realisation. The sacrifice of the intellect rather than its consecration was demanded. Mankind was to remain in bondage to the dead hand of the past. The progress that was being rapidly made in human knowledge was to be ignored. Catholicism was never to go beyond its medieval exponents. Conciliation and compromise with the new views was consequently treason, and "No surrender" was the cry.

Paul III stood aloof and looked on as the new power grew in strength and made itself felt in the Church. The last of the Renaissance Popes, he was liberal in his sympathies, but he never gave his whole confidence to any party. The reformed and tolerant Catholicism, which seemed about to prevail in the early years of his reign, found itself only partially supported, if not abandoned, and others were allowed to frustrate its efforts. Contarini, on his return to Italy after the Colloquy of Ratisbon, was rewarded with the government of Bologna, but his influence was gone. His death occurred soon after, on August 24, 1542, and he was spared the further disillusionment which the Council would have inevitably brought to him. He was one of the noblest figures in an age of great men, and the blessing of the peacemaker was his. Giberti survived him little more than a year, dying on December 30, 1543. The loss of Contarini and Giberti was an irreparable blow to the party of conciliation. Sadoleto, Pole, and Morone survived; but none of them had the force of character to fight a losing cause; and Pole and Morone ended their days in trying to vindicate their orthodoxy, the one by playing the part of a persecutor in England, the other by winding up the Council in the papal interest. For the time, however, Viterbo, of which Pole was governor, became the centre of the remnants of that little band which had first found a common bond in the Oratory of Divine Love. Everything now depended on the coming Council, and there was nothing but to await events.

Though the Colloquy of Ratisbon had failed to achieve any permanent result, yet the Emperor did not altogether despair of conciliation. The varying circumstances of the political situation from time to time affected his attitude towards the Lutherans; but he appears to have had a genuine desire all along for a thorough reformation of abuses in the Church by a General Council, from which the Roman Court itself was not to be exempt. Paul III, on the other hand, had little desire for a Council, at which it was clear, after the events at Ratisbon, that the papal prerogative was likely to be severely handled. It was impossible for him, however, to resist the demands of the Emperor altogether; and,

after an interview between them at Lucca, Paul III at length again agreed to summon a Council. Accordingly on May 22, 1542, a Bull was published summoning a General Council to meet at Trent on November 1, 1542. Trent was selected as the place of assembly, with the hope of satisfying the German demand that the Council should meet on German territory. Though the population of Trent was mainly Italian, it was within the Empire and under the protection of Charles' brother Ferdinand. At the same time it was easy of access to the Italian Bishops, and was not so far distant as to be beyond the Pope's control. It was an ecclesiastical principality under its Bishop, Christofero Madruzzo, Cardinal of Trent.

In August, 1542, Parisio, Morone, and Pole, the Legates appointed to open the Council, started for Trent; and the Council was duly opened on November 1. There were, however, only a few Italian prelates present; and, as no more arrived, by a Bull of July 6, 1543, the Pope again adjourned the Council. The war between Charles and Francis I again made the Council impossible; and at the Diet of Speier in 1544 it was agreed that all proceedings against the Lutherans should be stayed until a free and general Council could be held in Germany. Charles also promised to hold a Diet in which the religious questions should again be discussed and if possible arranged. The Lutherans were privately assured that an endeavour should be made to frame a scheme of comprehension, and that the Pope should not be allowed to stand in the way.

The proceedings at Speier seriously alarmed the Pope; and on August 5, 1544, he addressed a strong letter of remonstrance to the Emperor. The sin of Eli would be his, he wrote, if he did not lift up his voice against the unwarranted interference in the affairs of religion by the Emperor and the Diet. Toleration was pernicious, and the attempt to regulate the affairs of the Church in a national assembly largely composed of laymen unheard of. He was himself desirous of a reformation, and had declared this often by promising a Council; and it was the Emperor himself who, through the war, was hindering the one means which could restore the peace of Christendom. The Pope now saw that it was necessary for him to take active steps if the control of the situation was not to pass out of his hands. Unless something was done, Charles might be driven to follow the example of Henry VIII, and the German Church might fall away from the Holy See. The Council must be held in order to satisfy Charles, but it must be conducted with quite other objects than those contemplated by him. The formulation of doctrine should be its chief business. The old traditional doctrine of the Church must be laid down afresh so as to make all conciliation of the Protestants impossible. All discussion of the papal prerogatives must be avoided; and the reform of practical abuses must take quite a secondary place. Having enunciated the Church's doctrine, the Council might leave to the Holy Father the carrying out of such reforms as were necessary. The Council

in fact was to be used as an agent of the Counter-Reformation and as another means to the defeat of Protestantism.

All the resources of a skilful and patient diplomacy were now devoted to this end. A Bull was published on November 30, 1544, summoning the Council to meet on March 14, 1545; and Cardinal Alessandro Farnese was sent to Germany to come, if possible, to an understanding with the Emperor. In September, 1544, the Treaty of Crépy had been signed, and it was no longer so essential to Charles to keep on good terms with the Lutherans. The Emperor and the Papacy soon began to draw nearer to one another. Charles refused to confirm the rights of the Lutherans without regard to the proceedings of the Council, but at the same time he proceeded with the greatest caution. He did not feel strong enough as yet to provoke a general contest with German Protestantism. The Turkish danger was again imminent, and the Imperial treasury was empty. It thus came about that, when at length the Papacy was willing to proceed actively with the Council, the Emperor on the other hand wished to defer it for a time, as it seemed likely to drive the Lutherans to desperation. Charles accordingly at the Diet of Worms in 1545 allowed the religious question to be again discussed, and proposed another colloquy of the theologians. Until the Diet was concluded he requested the Pope to defer the opening of the Council. Paul III vigorously protested against what was nothing short of an insult to the Council; and the negotiations proceeded. Charles even went so far as to propose the transference of the Council to a really German town, from Trent which was only German in name, and the Pope replied by threatening to translate it to Rome or Bologna. Charles then saw that further concession was necessary, as he could not afford to risk the hostility of the whole of Germany, which this transfer would inevitably provoke. In October, 1545, accordingly, after the conclusion of the Diet of Worms, he requested the Pope to open the Council as quickly as possible at Trent; and informed him that the religious negotiations at the Diet were not seriously intended, and that their only purpose was to deceive the Protestants until his military preparations were ready and he should be able to crush them.

The negotiations that led up to the opening of the Council thus ended in a triumph for the Papacy; and the Protestants had little to expect from a Council which began under such auspices. Their only hope lay in a conflict of interests between the Emperor and the Pope, and these Powers now appeared in close alliance. Their agreement was not however so close as it appeared, and the Papacy felt that only the first step had been gained. Charles, even when in alliance with the Pope, never intended the Council to content itself with a solemn publication of Catholic dogmas to the world A reform of the Church in head and members was necessary, even if the wishes of the Protestants were to be ignored. Charles never had any intention of merely playing the papal game. The

exigencies of the political situation would determine the extent of the concessions he would make to the Papacy; and Paul III felt that it was no easy task which still lay before him.

Paul III deemed it unwise to preside in person at the Council. An old man of nearly eighty, the prospect of the journey and a lengthy sojourn at Trent was alone sufficient to deter him from the idea; besides which it was better for the Papacy to avoid being directly involved in the struggle of parties which was inevitable at the Council. He accordingly appointed three Legates to preside over its meetings and to conduct the business. They were to keep in close communication with Rome, and no important matter was to be decided until he had been consulted. His choice fell upon Giovanni Maria del Monte, Marcello Cervini, Cardinal of Santa Croce, and Reginald Pole. Del Monte and Cervini were entirely devoted to the papal interest. The former was hasty and impatient, a worldly Cardinal of the unreformed papal Court. Cervini represented the party of Caraffa and the new Catholicism, intolerant, narrow, and uncompromising, but keenly anxious for the removal of moral abuses in the Church. Cervini, moreover, was a diplomatist of the first order; and it was due to him that the numerous rocks and shoals on which the Papacy stood in danger of being wrecked during the Council were skilfully avoided. He prevented many a scene, which the haughtiness of del Monte had provoked, from becoming serious; and none knew better how to pour oil on troubled waters. Pole was little more than a cipher from the beginning. His academic mind was helpless amidst the play of living forces in which he found himself; and he had to acquiesce in the policy of his colleagues who had the Papacy behind them. His nomination as Legate was only intended to give the appearance of conciliation to the papal policy, and he felt himself helpless from the first. He spoke several times in favour of moderation, but soon lost heart. His ill health provided him with a convenient pretext to withdraw later from a scene in which he was doomed to be a failure. Great as was his intellectual ability, he had none of the qualities of a leader; and he was unequal to playing the part that Contarini might have played in the Council.

On March 13, 1545, the Legates made their solemn entry into Trent. They had the vaguest instructions, and could do nothing but wait, while the negotiations mentioned above went on between Charles and the Pope. At length, when a favourable juncture seemed to have arrived, the Pope ordered them to open the Council on December 13, 1545, and bade a number of Italian Bishops make their way to Trent. The attendance at the opening ceremony was but meagre. Besides the Legates and Cardinal Madruzzo, the Bishop of Trent, only four Archbishops, twenty Bishops, and five Generals of Orders, with a small number of theologians, were present. Of the Bishops, five were Spanish and two French; and Sweden, England, and Ireland were represented by one Bishop each.

Cardinal Madruzzo was the only prelate who in any sense could be said to represent the Empire; and the rest were Italians.

The first three sessions were spent in making the necessary arrangements for the business of the Council. A division of opinion at once arose as to the exact title to be used. The proposal of the Legates "*Sacrosancta Tridentina synodus in Spiritu sancto legitime congregata in ea praesidentibus tribus apostolicae sedis legatis,*" was not satisfactory to a portion of the Council; and it was proposed to add the words "*universalem ecclesiam repraesentans.*" The intention of the amendment was to express the superiority of the Council even to the Pope, and to revive the memories of Constance and Basel. The Legates expressed their dislike of it to the Pope on these grounds, though in public they resisted it merely as being unnecessary; and they succeeded in obtaining the rejection of the proposal. A question of more practical importance followed as to the right of voting At Constance voting had been by nations; and Abbots and theologians, as well as Bishops and Generals of Orders, were allowed to vote. The Bishops were, however, very jealous of their privileges; and it was decided to confine the power of voting to Bishops and heads of religious Orders. The claim of absent Bishops to vote by proxy was rejected by the Legates by order of the Pope. Only Bishops "*in partibus*" might represent their diocesans. This was a great victory for the curial party. In the absence of voting by nations, it ensured a preponderant influence to the Italian Bishops, who were mostly blind adherents to the Papacy. Many of them were very poor and were in fact dependent upon the Legates for their daily bread. The papal pensions and the hope of being rewarded with lucrative offices kept them loyal to the Curia, the interests of which were largely their own.

It was from the Spanish Bishops on the other hand that the Legates had most to fear. Charles had issued peremptory orders for them to attend the Council; and they became the backbone of the opposition to the pretensions of the Curia. The work of Ximenes had borne good fruit; and the Spanish Bishops were the most learned and the ablest among the members of the Council. Their orthodoxy was unimpeachable, they had no sympathy with the wishes of the moderate party for conciliation in doctrine, but equally with them they were determined to maintain the supremacy of the Council to the Pope, and to remove the abuses of the papal Court. So alarmed were the Legates by their arrival and by the prospects of an increase in their number, that they wrote to the Pope urgently requesting that ten or twelve capable Italian Bishops of proved fidelity might be sent to the Council to resist them.

The divergence between the interests of the Curia with its Italian supporters and the foreign Fathers was plainly revealed when the order of business came to be determined. In his instructions to the Legates Paul III clearly laid down that reform was only a secondary and less important cause of the convocation of the Council. Its principal work

was to be the definition of dogma. It was for this latter purpose that Paul III had consented to summon the Council. By proclaiming anew the old dogmas reconciliation with the Protestants would be rendered impossible; and before any reforms hostile to the papal interests could be undertaken it would probably be possible to bring the Council to an end. The Emperor and the Spanish Bishops, together with the few moderate and independent men among the Italians, had however no intention of meekly submitting to the indefinite postponement of the consideration of reform. When the Church had been purified, then the time would come for the discussion of questions of doctrine. Led by Cardinal Madruzzo, who represented the imperial views, they insisted on reform being taken in hand at once. The Legates were placed in a very difficult position and were afraid of risking an open defeat. Feeling ran so high in the Council, that an open revolt was likely if they insisted on beginning with the discussion of doctrine alone. They accordingly, at the suggestion of Thomas Campeggio, the Bishop of Feltre, proposed a compromise, that doctrine and reform should be treated at the same time by the separate commissions, and should come before the Council in alternation; and for this proposal, in spite of the opposition of Cardinal Madruzzo, they obtained a majority on January 22, 1546. The compromise was a partial defeat to the curial party and revealed the strength of the opposition. The Pope was furious and called upon the Legates to get the decision rescinded. The Legates, however, pointed out that this was impossible; and the Pope accordingly acquiesced with a bad grace. He, however, prohibited the discussion of any plan for the reform of the Roman Court until it had been first referred to him. As a consolation the Legates reminded the Pope that they could always lengthen the discussion on the dogmas, so as to receive his opinion on the questions of reform that were under consideration at the same time.

The details of the procedure of the Council were arranged with less difficulty. The whole Synod was divided into three classes, and the work of preparation was distributed between them. A preliminary discussion of each question, after it had been prepared by the theologians and canonists, was to take place in the special congregation to which it was allotted. The matter was then to be further discussed in a General Congregation of the whole Synod; and if approved it was to be promulgated in a solemn session of the Council. The rules of procedure being thus settled, the dogmatic discussions were opened at the Fourth Session, which began on April 8, 1546.

The rule of Faith was first considered. The Nicene Creed including the *filioque* had been reaffirmed in the Third Session with the significant description "*symbolum fidei quo sancta* Romana *ecclesia utitur.*" The sources of knowledge of religious truth were now examined; and Scripture and tradition were set side by side as having equal authority. Tradition was defined as "*traditio Christi*" and "*traditio apostolorum* (*Spiritu Sancto*

dictante)." The Church alone had the right to expound Scripture; but silence was maintained as to the relations of the Pope and the Church in the matter. The traditional Canon of Scripture was accepted; and the Vulgate was declared the authoritative text, which no one was to presume to reject.

It was not to be expected that these definitions would be accepted without opposition. Nacchianti, Bishop of Chioggia, maintained that Scripture was the sole rule of faith; but he found only six supporters. Others proposed to distinguish between apostolic traditions and tradition in general, but they also met with defeat. The declaration that the text of the Vulgate was infallible was out of harmony with the knowledge of the time, and met with criticism in the papal household itself. The enthusiasm of the theologians at Trent, mostly Dominicans, for medieval theology was almost too zealous to please the Roman Court. The Pope could not help feeling a certain displeasure at the Council coming to a decision on such fundamental points without consulting the Holy See. He directed the Legates to have the decrees of the Fourth Session examined anew; but, on their protesting, he gave way and abandoned the idea of dictating directly to the Council, on condition that its decrees should always be submitted for his approbation before being published.

In accordance with the order of business agreed upon, reform was next taken in hand; and a discussion began upon a difficult point of discipline, the question as to the rules for preaching and catechising. This raised the contentious question of the relation of the Bishops to the regular clergy. Stormy scenes took place, and reverend prelates gave one another the lie. The Bishops of Fiesole and Chioggia were the most offensive to the Legates, on account of their plain speaking, and their recall from the Council was requested of the Pope. A considerable number of Bishops demanded that there should be no exemptions from episcopal control. The discussion soon passed to wider issues. It was claimed that the residence of Bishops in their dioceses was "*jure divino*," and that the Pope therefore possessed no power of dispensing with it. The Legates, however, succeeded in keeping to the question immediately before them; and it was finally decided that, while the regulars were to be allowed to preach in the churches of their own Order without episcopal permission, they were to be prohibited from doing so in other churches without the license of the Ordinary.

Original Sin was the next subject of discussion; and this led on to the thorny paths of Free Will and Justification. The Emperor endeavoured to defer the discussion on these speculative points; but the Pope was determined to obtain definitions which would make the breach with the Protestants irreparable. The Legates again (June 2, 1546) requested that more Italian Bishops might be sent to the Council to cope with the opposition; and the consideration of the nature of Justification was entered upon. A Neapolitan, Thomas de San Felicio, Bishop of La

Cava, and a few theologians, maintained the doctrine of Justification by Faith alone, but their views could obtain no hearing; and a scene ensued in which San Felicio and a Greek Bishop fell upon one another, and the latter's beard was torn out in handfuls. The discussion then confined itself to the mediating view which Contarini had advocated in his *Tractatus de Justificatione*. Pighius, Pflug, and Gropper had maintained a similar position in Germany; and it had the adherence of some of the ablest Catholic intellects, both north and south of the Alps. Seripando, the General of the Augustinians, was the chief champion in the Council of this view. Seripando in many respects resembled Sadoleto. The best elements of humanism and Christianity were united in him; and the position he took up on this doctrine was in harmony with the traditions of the Augustinian Order. He distinguished between an "inherent" and an "imputed" righteousness; and the "inherent" only justified because of the "imputed"; the one was needed to complete the other. In the imputed righteousness of Christ alone, however, lay our final hope. The inherent righteousness, the righteousness of works, was by itself of no avail.

It was in this discussion that Laynez and Salmeron, the two Jesuits who had been brought to the Council by Cervini as the Pope's theologians, first played a prominent part in the debates of the assembly. Ignatius was of opinion that the Council was not of very high importance; but he wished his Society to receive favourable notice there. Laynez and Salmeron had received very careful instructions as to their behaviour in the Council. They were to use every opportunity for preaching and carrying on pastoral work. Dogmatics, however, were to be avoided in the pulpit, and no excessive asceticism that might be repellent was to be practised. The *Spiritual Exercises* were to be introduced whenever an occasion offered itself. In the meetings of the Council they were to speak with moderation and avoid giving offence; but they were to oppose anything approaching to the new views. Every night they were to meet and discuss their joint plans of action with Le Jay.

The politic instructions of Ignatius, which Laynez and Salmeron faithfully carried out, were eminently successful. The Jesuits were exempted from the general prohibition of preaching during the Council, and soon obtained considerable influence with the Spanish Bishops. They came to be known as the great advocates of purity of dogma and scholasticism in the Council; and their importance rapidly increased. When Ignatius wished to recall Laynez, Cervini wrote to say that he was indispensable. With regard to the conflicting claims of the Papacy and the Bishops, Ignatius wished the Jesuits to play the *rôle* of mediator; but this position was soon abandoned, and they became the scientific supporters of the Roman claims. Their skill in patristic and scholastic quotation was remarkable, and they read to the Council what were whole treatises rather than speeches.

Laynez especially devoted himself to the great question of Justification. While admitting the distinction between "inherent" and "imputed" righteousness, he maintained that the "imputed" righteousness became involved in the "inherent." The merits of Christ were imparted to man through faith; and we must rely on the merits of Christ not because they complete but because they produce our own. The efficacy of works was thus implied. Seripando had maintained that we must rely on the "imputed" righteousness: the righteousness of Christ was alone true and sufficient, and it was our faith in that which ultimately justified us. Such a view made reconciliation with the Protestants not impossible, while that of Laynez brought all hopes of agreement to an end.

In his speech against Seripando, Laynez pointed out with great skill the weakness of mediating theology; and the superficial clearness of his logic appealed to the assembled Fathers. The moderate party, though unable to persuade the Council of their views, were yet able to obtain a decree on the subject sufficiently ambiguous to allow the possibility of the development of Jansenism in the future. The formula, however, made reconciliation with the Protestants impossible; and the Papacy and the Jesuits thus obtained their object. Pole exhorted the Council not to reject any opinion simply because it was held by Luther, but his voice had little weight. Seripando was left to lead the moderates; and Pole left the Council at the end of June, his health breaking down, and retired to Padua. In August the Pope requested him to return to Trent, but he excused himself; and in October he was definitely relieved of his functions. Meanwhile the decrees of the Fifth Session were solemnly published on June 17, 1546; and Paul III approved and ratified by a brief the decrees with regard to preaching. Only the Bishop of Fiesole protested against this indirect claim of the Pope that the decrees of the Council required his assent and confirmation.

Though the Legates had successfully steered their way through the discussions on the most fundamental points of doctrine, they still feared the determination of the Emperor and the Spanish Bishops to carry out a thorough reform. To prevent this they endeavoured to procure the translation of the Council to an Italian town where it would be more completely under their control. Madruzzo, who was the energetic advocate of the Emperor's ideas on the subject of reform, had several acrimonius conflicts with the irritable del Monte; and the situation again became strained. Cardinal Pachecho went so far as to accuse the Legates of falsifying the votes. The charge was groundless, but it is an indication how high feeling ran. The Emperor peremptorily refused to consent to the translation of the Council; and the Legates had to content themselves with endeavouring to obtain the solemn publication of the decrees on Justification. A further rampart against the Protestants in the form of doctrinal decrees upon the Sacraments was also prepared;

and, while the Emperor endeavoured to prevent further definition of doctrine, the Legates did all they could to hasten it on. Fearing to press the Emperor too far, Cervini, diplomatic as ever, proposed a compromise The publication of the decrees on Justification was to be delayed, if the Emperor would consent to the suspension of the Council for six months and to all disciplinary reform being left to the Pope. The Emperor however rejected the proposal at once; and the Legates then, on December 29, 1546, persuaded the Council to agree to the publication of the decrees on Justification at the Sixth Session on January 13, 1547. This was accordingly done; and the decrees were confirmed by the Pope, who, as a concession to the Council in return for the adjournment of the question of the residence of Bishops, proceeded to publish a Bull requiring Cardinals holding bishoprics in plurality to resign them within a certain date. So far as it was carried out, the Bull was little more than a dead letter, as they reserved to themselves many pensions and charges upon the revenues of the sees which they resigned.

Rapid progress was made meanwhile with the decrees on the Sacraments, while that on the residence of Bishops was again delayed. The view that residence was "*jure divino*," and therefore not dispensable by the Pope, was again insisted on by the Spanish Bishops; and Carranza wrote a special treatise on the subject. But the servile Italian majority was continually increasing; and, when the independent Bishop of Fiesole maintained that the Episcopate possessed all spiritual powers in itself and that Bishops were not simply the delegates of the Pope, the manuscript of his speech was demanded, in order that he might be proceeded against for derogating from the authority of the Holy See. This was however too much for the Council; and such a storm ensued that his manuscript was returned to him. The Legates however succeeded in avoiding any mention of the Cardinals in the decree on residence, and no reference was made to the question whether it was "*jure divino*" or not. Residence was simply declared necessary, and power was given to Bishops to visit all the churches of their diocese, including the Cathedral Chapter. The whole decree was, however, limited by the prescription that it was not to diminish in any way the authority of the Holy See. In this form it was solemnly published at the Seventh Session on March 5, 1547, together with decrees on the Sacraments in general, and on baptism and confirmation.

While affairs were thus proceeding in the Council, the Emperor was obtaining a series of successes in Germany which alarmed the Pope. Paul III had no desire to see Charles too powerful, and was afraid that he might come in person to Italy and insist on far-reaching reforms. He therefore determined to authorise the Legates to transfer the Council to Bologna. The translation was not, however, to be carried out on the sole authority of the Legates, but they were to endeavour to obtain a vote of the Council approving of it. A convenient pretext was found

in the fact that there had been a few cases of plague in Trent; and, on the ground that the health of the Fathers was endangered, at the Eighth public Session (March 11, 1547) the Council by 38 votes to 14, with 4 abstentions, decided to adjourn to Bologna. Cardinal Pachecho and the Spanish Bishops however remained at Trent and awaited the Emperor's orders.

Charles was exceedingly angry when he heard the news. He refused in any way to recognise the translation of the Council; and the Spanish Bishops were prohibited from quitting Trent on any pretext whatsoever. They were, however, to refrain from any conciliar act which might provoke a schism. The course of European politics during the next two years has been narrated elsewhere. Charles remained firm. His political difficulties did not diminish, but the mission of Cardinal Sfondrato did not move him, and Paul III was disappointed of his hopes from France. The Diet of Augsburg recognised the prelates at Trent as the true Council; and the Emperor attempted to settle the religious affairs of the nation by the *Interim* until a General Council acceptable to him should meet. Nothing remained for Paul III but to bow to the inevitable; and on September 17, 1549, he formally suspended the Council of Bologna. The Pope made a show of himself undertaking the reform of the Church, and appointed a commission of Cardinals for the purpose; but before his real intentions in the matter could become clear he died (November 10, 1549).

The Cardinal del Monte came out of the conclave as Julius III on February 7, 1550. Reginald Pole was nearly elected, but Caraffa reminded the Conclave of his Lutheran tendencies at the Council, and succeeded in turning the scale against him. Cervini was the candidate of the party of reaction; but the Imperialists regarded him as their most dangerous enemy at Trent and secured his exclusion. Del Monte, though he had been not less hostile to the interests of the Emperor, might be gained over; and events justified to some extent their anticipations. The new Pope was utterly selfish. He only desired to enjoy the Papacy in peace, and he was quite willing to acquiesce in the Emperor's wishes, so far as they did not entail any loss of power to the Holy See. He at once agreed to the return of the Council to Trent, and on November 14, 1550, published a Bull summoning it to meet on May 1, 1551. In return for a guarantee from the Emperor that the papal authority should remain intact, he even consented to leave it an open question whether the preceding decisions of the Council were binding and to grant the Lutherans a hearing.

The new Pontificate seemed to be opening under the most favourable auspices. Reform was again entered upon at Rome. A commission of six Cardinals was appointed to consider the conditions of appointment to benefices, and another commission to reform the procedure of Conclaves. Difficulties, however, soon arose. Henry II of France wished

the Pope to join a league against the Emperor, and, when he declined, refused to recognise the coming Council. The German Bishops, and still more the Protestants, despaired of any good result from another papal assembly, and showed no eagerness to attend. The Spaniards likewise were reluctant to take a long journey which would probably be fruitless. Only some forty prelates were present at Trent when the Council was reopened on May 1, 1551. Cardinal Marcello Crescenzio, together with two Bishops, Pighino, Archbishop of Siponto, and Lippomano, Bishop of Verona, were the papal representatives. The two Bishops, with the title of Nuncios, were to assist Crescenzio, who alone exercised the legatine authority.

The choice of presidents did not augur well for the success of the Assembly. Crescenzio was a blind adherent of the Papacy, and obstinate to boot; and his assistants were equally attached to the curial party. They well understood that it was their business to proceed further with the emphatic restatement of the old dogma in the interests of the Papacy, which had been so successfully begun. The Papacy had no more intention of conciliation in doctrine than it had during the Sessions held under Paul III. The second meeting at Trent was thus, from the beginning, doomed to failure so far as the Protestants were concerned, as the first had been. The Emperor and the Pope were no more in real agreement than before. The meagre attendance at the opening left no alternative to the Council but to adjourn; and September 1 was accordingly fixed for the first (Twelfth) public Session. By that time the Electors of Mainz and Trier had arrived, together with a few other German and Spanish Bishops. It was agreed to take up the work at the point at which it had been dropped in the previous assembly of the Council; and in this manner all its previous decisions were tacitly confirmed. In such circumstances it was little good attempting to persuade the Protestants to send representatives to the Council; but nevertheless the Emperor persevered in the attempt

The doctrine of the Eucharist was the first subject entered upon by the Council. Laynez and Salmeron, who again appeared in the Council as the Pope's theologians, and with a greater influence than ever, strongly opposed any concession to Protestant views in the matter, even in points of discipline, such as communion in both kinds. The Jesuits had a considerable share in drawing up the decrees and adopted a purely conservative attitude. The German prelates, however, and a few others advocated strongly a concession with regard to the cup. Finally, at the request of the representative of the Emperor, the matter was deferred until the Protestants should arrive. Meanwhile the discussion on reform was resumed. The abuse of the right of appeal to the Pope from the episcopal Courts was prohibited, and the procedure of the Courts regulated. Decrees to this effect, together with the decisions on the Eucharist, omitting those on communion in both kinds, were promulgated at

the Thirteenth public Session, which was held on October 11, 1551. A safe-conduct was also granted to the Protestants who should attend the Council, though not until after much negotiation as to its exact wording.

The Legate began now to grow anxious as to the course affairs would take on the arrival of the Protestants, and tried to hasten the deliberations of the Council. At the general Congregation on November 5, Crescenzio proposed that the Fathers, in order to save time, should simply accept or reject the articles that the theologians had prepared. The proposal was, however, rejected by a bare majority. As the two Jesuits were now the most influential among the theologians, the success of the Legate's proposal would have meant that they would have practically dictated the decrees of the Council.

The Sacraments of Penance and of Extreme Unction were next discussed, together with thirteen further decrees on reform. Many minor grievances were removed, but burning questions were skilfully avoided. The conclusions arrived at were promulgated at the Fourteenth public Session, held on November 25, 1551. At length, in January, 1552, some Protestant delegates arrived in Trent, representing the Duke of Würtemberg, the Elector Maurice of Saxony, and a few of the south German towns. The Legate opposed their admission to the public Congregation unless they first accepted all the conclusions of the Council; but the representatives of the Emperor finally overcame the opposition of the Legate, and the delegates were allowed to address the general Congregation on January 24, 1552. The only result was to reveal how wide was the gulf between the Council and the Protestants. Nevertheless, at the Fifteenth public Session on January 25, 1552, it was decided to adjourn the next public Session until March 19, 1552, in order to enable other Protestants to arrive; and another and more explicit safe-conduct was granted to them. The theological discussions meanwhile continued, but nothing was done. It was obvious that the situation was hopeless. In February many of the Bishops departed. In March the Protestant delegates also left; and finally, on the news of the rapid advance of Maurice of Saxony, the Council was suspended on April 28, 1552.

The Peace of Passau (1552) and its confirmation at the Diet of Augsburg (1555) marked the failure of the Emperor's policy. The unity of the Church was definitely broken. The two Confessions were compelled to tolerate one another in their respective spheres; and all attempts at conciliation and compromise were abandoned. So far as the Papacy was concerned, the Council passed away as a bad dream. Julius III determined to risk no more experiments; and the remainder of his pontificate was spent in beautifying his villa near the *Porta del Popolo*, the *Villa di Papa Giulio*, which is his chief memorial. On his death on March 24, 1555, Cervini at last ascended the papal throne as Marcellus II.

He was the first true Pope of the Counter-Reformation, of blameless life and untarnished orthodoxy, and zealous for reform. A friend of the Jesuits, he was at the same time tactful and diplomatic; and he well understood the maxim that on occasions more prudence and less piety was better than more piety and less prudence. But Marcellus II only survived his election three weeks, and was succeeded by the uncompromising Caraffa, who took the title of Paul IV. The Counter-Reformation was now master.

The new reign began in earnest with reform. The Papacy itself would purify the Church and needed no Council to assist it. A Bull was published announcing that the first care of the new Pontiff would be the reform of the universal Church and of the Roman Court. Congregations were appointed to carry out this announcement. Edict after edict was issued for the reform of convents; and the whole method of appointment to clerical offices was overhauled. But what no one could have anticipated happened. Reform and the Catholic reaction were sacrificed to what Paul IV thought were the political interests of the Holy See. He had ever been a hater of Spain, and he now made it his object to free the Papacy from its thraldom. His unworthy nephews attained an ascendancy over him by playing upon the anti-Spanish mania of the old man. The purification of the Church sank into the background.

But the failure of his nephews to achieve the object dearest to his heart opened his eyes towards the end of the year 1558; and, when Cardinal Pachecho had the courage at the session of the Inquisition on January 9, 1559, to reply to Paul's excited cries of "Reform! Reform!," "Holy Father, reform must first of all begin among ourselves," the Pope was convicted of sin. His nephews were banished, and reform of the whole administration in Church and State was again begun. A large remission of taxation had marked Paul's accession, and the burdens of the people were now still further lightened. The *Dataria*, on which all the schemes of reform under Paul III had been shattered, was taken in hand once more, and with a considerable measure of success. The removal of vexatious taxation and of the toll on good works was pressed forward. At the beginning of the reign Ignatius and Laynez had been consulted; and Paul IV realised from the example of their Society that freedom of spiritual services was the road to success. He saw that the whole system of fees levied on every possible occasion was utterly bad. Marriage dispensations, a very profitable source of revenue, he would have none of. Officials must not live by Court fees, nor should their offices be bought and sold, or performed by a deputy who had to make his own profit. In short, the object of Paul's reforms was to substitute direct for indirect taxation. The levying of tenths was approved; and the people were to be taught that it was their duty to give directly towards the support of the Holy See. At the same time Paul IV recognised that too many of the rights of the Bishops had been absorbed by Rome; and in

this way many of his reforms anticipated the ordinances made later in the last Sessions of the Council of Trent.

An equal zeal for purity of doctrine and for purity of life was shown by the energetic old man. The Inquisition exercised its powers with the utmost vigour, and even Cardinals were not spared. Morone was imprisoned; and the suppression of liberal Catholicism as well as Protestant opinions was now definitely taken in hand. The Inquisition and the Index suppressed the slightest tendency to diverge from medieval theology. The spirit of Ignatius and his Society had now taken possession of the Church.

Paul IV, however, died on August 18, 1559; and an immediate reaction set in in Rome. The severity of his measures had made him many enemies; and even among those in favour of reform there was a considerable number who had no wish that it should be the arbitrary work of the Pope. All the Cardinals accordingly, before entering the Conclave, bound themselves to summon anew the General Council in the case of their being elected; and on December 26, 1559, Giovanni Angelo de' Medici (Medicino) was elected Pope. He was a Milanese, of middle-class origin, and unconnected with the great Florentine family. Learned and kindly and of exemplary life, he was better acquainted with the times in which he lived than his predecessor had been. He wished to live at peace with all men, and to win the support of the Catholic monarchs for the Holy See. At the same time, he had no intention of suffering any diminution of the papal prerogative. Before his accession he had expressed himself in favour of concessions in discipline, such as the practice of communion in both kinds; and he believed that by this means a Council might heal the divisions of the Catholic world without endangering the rights of the Holy See. Events showed that it was not so easy to confine the issues to such narrow lines; but at the opening of his reign Pius IV looked forward to a Council with no misgiving.

The Emperor Ferdinand and Francis II of France greeted with approval the proposals of the Pope to hold a Council. But they at once proceeded to name conditions which were received with little favour at Rome. Complete freedom must be given to the Council. It must be held in a German town, and it should work above all for the reconciliation of the Protestants. In view of these proposals, Pius IV, chiefly under the influence of his nephew Carlo Borromeo, Secretary of State, drew back from the idea of a Council. The Pope, in his turn, made impossible conditions, and considered the question of carrying out the necessary reforms by means of Congregations of Cardinals. Events in France, however, compelled the Pope to proceed with the proposed Council. The States-General at Orleans (January 10, 1561) ordered the French Bishops to meet on January 20, 1561, to prepare for a National Council if the announcement which had been made of a General Council were not carried out. A papal Bull had been issued on November 29, 1560, summoning a Council to Trent for April 6, 1561; and Pius hastened to assure the

French of the seriousness of his intentions. The French national synod was accordingly abandoned; and Trent was accepted as the place of meeting. Before the assembly could meet there was, however, another difficulty to be settled. The Emperor and the French government wished for an explicit declaration that the Council was a new assembly, and not merely a continuation of the previous Sessions at Trent as Philip II and the Spanish Church insisted. The sympathies of the Pope were with Philip; but it was necessary not to offend the Emperor and the French. Accordingly the question was left in doubt, and no definite pronouncement was made on the matter.

Meanwhile the preparations for the Council went on. The Pope instructed his Nuncios to invite all Christian Princes to the Council, whether schismatic or not. The Protestant Powers, however, had little confidence in the proposed assembly; and it soon became clear that the Council would be confined to the nations still in communion with the See of Rome. Ferdinand, however, and the French government had no intention of allowing the Council simply to register the wishes of the Curia. Both Powers wished for concessions which might unite to the Church the moderate Protestants and disaffected Catholics in their dominions. The reforms which they desired are enumerated in the instructions given to the French ambassadors at the Council, and in the *Libel of Reformation* which the Emperor caused to be drawn up. The Mass in the vulgar tongue, revision of the service books, communion in both kinds, the marriage of priests, reform of the Curia and a reduction in the number of Cardinals, the enforcement of residence on ecclesiastics, the abolition of the whole system of dispensations and exemptions, and a limitation of the power of excommunication, were among the chief points demanded. The whole Church system was in fact to be revised, and the share of the Papacy in its government to be reduced. Bavaria supported most of these demands; and in fact nearly all Catholics north of the Alps desired a radical reform of the Church.

Philip II and the Spanish Bishops, on the other hand, wished for no alteration in the ritual and practice of the Church; but they equally desired a thorough reform of the Curia and a diminution of the papal authority. At the same time they wished it to be distinctly declared that the assembly was a continuation of the previous Council, and that an effectual bar should be thus provided against any advances towards Protestantism. The Spanish Bishops were opposed, even more strongly than the papal Court, to any alteration in the discipline and practice of the Church. The division among the Catholic Powers gave the Papacy a means of which it was quick to avail itself. The history of the third meeting of the Council of Trent is mainly the story of the skilful diplomacy with which the Papacy played off one nation against another and succeeded in bringing all efforts for radical reform to naught. The task was not difficult, as there was little cooperation among the Powers even

in the pursuit of objects which they had in common; and the Council ended in strengthening rather than weakening the papal grip upon the Church. The Papacy supported by the Italian episcopate defied the Christian world.

No less than five Legates were appointed to preside over the Council. At their head was placed Ercole di Gonzaga, Cardinal of Mantua, brother of the Duke, a man of conciliatory disposition; and he had for his colleagues Girolamo Seripando, the former General of the Augustinians, who had played a prominent part in the earlier Sessions, Luigi Simonetta, and Jacopo Puteo, both of them canonists of renown, and Stanislaus Hosius, who had worked hard against heresy in Poland. The last-named three were firmly devoted to the papal interests. Puteo, however, soon fell ill, and his place was taken by Cardinal Marc d'Altemps, Bishop of Constance, a young man of little experience. Ludovico Madruzzo, nephew of Cardinal Madruzzo, had succeeded his uncle in the bishopric of Trent, and received the Legates on their arrival on April 16, 1561.

The Bishops, however, arrived but slowly, and summer and autumn went by. At length the Pope could wait no longer, and fixed the first (Seventeenth) Session for January 18, 1562. There were then assembled for the opening of the Council five Cardinals, three Patriarchs, eleven Archbishops, ninety Bishops, four Generals of Orders, and four Abbots. The first business undertaken by the Council was the question of an Index of Prohibited Books. It was decided to revise the Index issued by Paul IV; and a commission of eighteen prelates was appointed for the purpose. A safe-conduct was then granted to any Protestants who might come to the Council in the same terms as that granted under Julius III. But this was nothing more than a formality, as there was not the least prospect that any would attend. It was, however, necessary to satisfy the Emperor so far. Although the numbers present at the opening of the Council were greater than they had ever been in any of the earlier Sessions at Trent or Bologna, the assembly was purely a gathering of the Catholic world. There was no longer even the possibility, which had existed at an earlier date, of a frank meeting of the Protestants and a consideration of their objections. The Papacy had defeated the attempt before, and mutual distrust now made it hopeless. The interest of the third meeting of the Council lies in the effort made by certain elements in Catholicism to readjust the balance of forces in the government of the Church, and to satisfy the needs of Catholics north of the Alps.

The cleft between the parties revealed itself at the very beginning of the Council. The Legates inserted in the decree concerning the opening of the Council the words "*proponentibus legatis ac praesidentibus.*" Against this the Spanish Bishops, led by Guerrero, Archbishop of Granada, protested. Its object was to diminish the independent power of the Council apart from the Pope, by taking away its right of

initiative. Any proposals hurtful to the Papacy and the Curia would thus be barred. Philip II through his ambassadors supported the objections of the Spanish Bishops to the clause. The Legates however explained the words away, and the opposition had not the courage to bring the matter to the vote. The situation at first was not very promising for the opposition. A little group of Spanish Bishops, led by a determined man, the Archbishop of Granada, stood face to face with an overwhelming number of Italian prelates, the great majority of whom were devoted to or dependent upon the Curia. A few northern Bishops and a few independent Italians supported them, but they were not certain of the help even of all the Spaniards. Some of these, chief of whom was the Bishop of Salamanca, had already been won over by the Curia. Behind the Spanish Bishops, however, were the Catholic Powers. All alike were determined to maintain the liberty of the Council to declare its supremacy over the Pope, and to free the Church from the curial despotism. There was, however, no harmony of action and a singular lack of cooperation among them, even for the objects which they had in common. Moreover their efforts were ultimately paralysed by the fact that, while the Emperor and France desired the Council to start entirely afresh and to make concessions in Church ritual and practice which would meet the needs of their respective countries, Spain, on the other hand, was determined that the Council should be considered a continuation of the old, and develop the old dogma and practice on the traditional lines. The skilled intriguers of the Curia found a promising field for their work.

The second (Eighteenth) public Session was held on February 26, 1562. The resolutions with regard to the Index and the safe-conduct to the Protestants were then published. The Congregations, meanwhile, proceeded with their work; and doctrine and reform were taken in hand together as before. The decrees on the Eucharist were taken up at the point where they had been left in 1552. Communion in both kinds, and the communion of children, remained to be considered. The articles of reform dealt with diocesan and parochial administration; and the question of the residence of Bishops was again raised. Simonetta endeavoured to avoid a declaration on the subject; but to this the Council would not consent; and on March 11, 1562, its discussion was begun by the general Congregation. The Council was unanimous as to the necessity of residence; the only disagreement was as to its being "*jure divino*" or merely "*lege ecclesiasticâ.*" This indirectly raised the question of the limits of papal authority; and the controversy soon became heated. The Legates were not agreed as to the attitude they should adopt. Simonetta opposed any concession on the subject, while the Cardinal of Mantua and Seripando hesitated. At length, on April 20, the Legates put the question to the vote. 66 voted for the divine nature of the obligation of residence, while 71 either rejected it absolutely

or voted for remitting the question to the Pope. The result was not altogether pleasing to the Curial party. Only a minority had voted for a direct negative on the subject. Simonetta wrote secret letters to Rome, accusing his colleagues of betraying the interests of the Holy See by precipitately putting the matter to the vote. The whole Council was now in a state of confusion. The Cardinal of Mantua and Seripando ceased to feel sure of their ground. The papal letters to the Legates changed their tone. Borromeo urged Simonetta to oppose any action of his colleagues which would be hurtful to the interests of the Holy See. The recall of the Cardinal of Mantua was seriously considered at Rome. Everything stood still while frequent letters were exchanged between the Legates and Rome. The French ambassador profanely remarked that the Council was not free, as the Holy Spirit came to Trent in the courier's bag from Rome.

To add to the difficulties of the Legates, on June 2 a despatch arrived from Rome ordering the Council to be definitely declared a continuation. Philip II had insisted on this, and the Pope had had to give way. But, no sooner had the news arrived, than the French and Imperial ambassadors declared that they and the prelates of their respective countries would take no further part in the Council if this were done. There was nothing for the Legates to do but to temporise, in spite of the distinct orders of the Pope; and on June 6 the Twentieth Session was held, merely to be prorogued. Meanwhile, the general Congregation continued the discussion of the decrees on the Eucharist; and here the question of communion in both kinds caused further trouble. A cross division of parties arose, Spain and Italy against France and Germany. The Imperial ambassadors allowed themselves to be outwitted by the Legates. The consideration of Ferdinand's *Libel of Reformation* was deferred; and the Council occupied itself with matters of purely secondary importance. The Legates knew well how to follow Borromeo's advice and to gain "*il beneficio del tempo.*"

Pius IV meanwhile hesitated. He gave way to the Legates on the point of the continuation and left the logic of facts to demonstrate its reality. He mollified Philip as best he could. With regard to the obligation of residence nothing was done. After the vote of April 20 the Legates had referred it to the Pope, and rumours reached Trent that Pius had declared it to be "*jure divino,*" but this was not confirmed. The Curia came to no decision. It was unwise to run counter to the opinion of the great majority of the Catholic world in the matter, and the question was left in suspense. To show the zeal of the Papacy three Bulls were published at the end of May reforming the Apostolic Chamber, the Penitentiary, and the Chancery, and meanwhile the Council marked time.

So hopeless did the situation appear that the Pope even contemplated the transference of the Council to an Italian town and a complete,

breach with the non-Italian nations. So strong an opposition, however, showed itself to the mere suggestion that the idea had to be abandoned; and other means were adopted to bring the Council to a more reasonable frame of mind. Carlo Visconti, afterwards Bishop of Ventimiglia, the Pope's confidential agent at Trent, worked unceasingly to increase the papal influence in the Council. The old methods were pursued with the Italian Episcopate. When a Bishop arrived at Trent, Visconti consulted with the Legates as to whether he should receive payment for his services or not. Those who could not be reached by pensions were not always proof against the hope of promotion in the Church. When these methods failed, threats were sometimes effective. The few independent Bishops underwent the most outrageous provocations and too easily lost heart. They gave up the struggle before it was half begun. The papal diplomacy was completely successful; and Philip was persuaded to order the Spanish Bishops to let the question of the divine obligation of residence drop for a while. Pius made matters smoother by taking the hint from Visconti to treat the Cardinal of Mantua with more consideration, and flattered many of the Bishops of the opposition with complimentary letters. Simonetta was warned not to show excessive zeal, and he and the Cardinal of Mantua were publicly reconciled.

The Twenty-first public Session was at length held on July 21, 1562, and the decrees on the Eucharist and on reform were solemnly published, the questions of the possibility of granting the chalice and the nature of the obligation of residence being skilfully avoided. The Council went on to discuss the doctrine of the Mass; and further decrees dealing with reform were drawn up. The Imperial ambassadors, who throughout the Council displayed little tact, pressed on the Legates an immediate consideration of the Emperor's demands for the use of the chalice in Germany. The Pope all along had not felt strongly on the point; and so persistent was the German demand that he was prepared to accede to it. The Spanish and Italian opposition to the concession was, however, very strong, and Laynez threw all his influence into the scale against it. He read a lengthy theological treatise on the subject, and influenced many votes. In these circumstances it would have been wise for the Emperor to proceed cautiously and not run the risk of an open defeat. The ambassadors, however, thought otherwise; and on August 22 the Cardinal of Mantua submitted the Emperor's proposal to the Council. The voting took place on September 6, when 29 voted in the affirmative simply; 31 in the affirmative with the proviso that the matter should be referred to the Pope; 19 were in favour of its being granted in Hungary and Bohemia alone; 38 rejected it absolutely; 10 did the same but desired to leave the definite decision to the Pope; 24 were in favour of its being left to the Pope without the Council expressing an opinion; and 14 thought the matter not yet ripe for decision. It was a

discouraging result for the Imperial ambassadors, but they made one more effort and moved a decree recommending to the Pope the request of the Emperor. This was, however, rejected by 79 to 69. The Cardinal of Mantua, however, came to the rescue, to avoid a breach with the Emperor, and on September 16 moved to refer the matter simply to the Pope, without any expression of opinion on the part of the Council. Simonetta gave his support to this proposal, and it was carried by 98 votes to 38. The Emperor thus at the best could get nothing from the Council, and was referred back to the Pope. At the Twenty-second public Session, which took place on the following day (September 17, 1562), the decrees on the Mass and a series of minor reforms were approved; but even then 31 Bishops voted against any reference of the question of the chalice to the Pope.

The Council then took up the discussion of the Sacrament of Orders. Though there was little disagreement as to the nature of the grace conferred in ordination, yet the question of the relations of the various members of the hierarchy to one another and to the Pope was likely to cause difficulty, and troubled waters were soon again entered upon. The French and Imperial ambassadors protested against any further definition of dogmas, and demanded that the Council should await the arrival of the French and German Bishops who were on their way. A thorough reform of the Church might then be entered upon. They further complained of the haste in which proceedings were conducted. The Legates only communicated the decrees on reform to the Bishops two days before the general Congregations, and it was impossible to examine them properly in that time. The Legates returned an evasive answer, and the discussions on the Sacrament of Orders were proceeded with. The papal legion was strengthened by the arrival of more Italian Bishops; and at the same time several of the more independent prelates left Trent. The Spaniards felt that it was necessary to assert themselves again; and on November 3 the Archbishop of Granada propounded the view that Bishops were the Vicars of Christ by the divine law under His chief Vicar the Bishop of Rome. This raised the whole question of the Pope's supremacy, and an angry debate ensued. The Bishop of Segovia went so far as to say that the supremacy of the Bishop of Rome was unknown to the primitive Church. Laynez again made himself the chief advocate of the papal prerogative and displayed a violent hostility to the Episcopate. In the midst of these discussions the Cardinal of Lorraine arrived with twelve French Bishops and three Abbots on November 13, 1562. The attitude which he would adopt was eagerly awaited by both parties. On November 23 the Cardinal appeared in the assembly and in a speech made similar demands to those made by the Emperor in the *Libel of Reformation*, and a little later declared himself in favour of the divine right of the Episcopate. On January 2, 1563, the French demands were formally presented to the Legates. The articles were thirty-four in

number and embraced most of the proposals previously demanded by the Emperor. They suffered the same fate as his and were simply forwarded to Rome for consideration.

It was now obvious to all that the Papacy had no intention of carrying out any reforms of importance. The papal policy was clearly expressed in a letter of Borromeo to the Legates, in which he informed them that they must keep two objects in sight, that of strengthening the papal power over the Council, and that of procuring its speedy dissolution. To this intent the Legates endeavoured to have the Pope described as "*rector universalis ecclesiae*" in the canon dealing with the Episcopate; but owing to the opposition of the Cardinal of Lorraine they failed. The interminable discussions continued; month after month passed by and nothing was done. At the beginning of February Ferdinand had moved to Innsbruck with the object of being nearer the scene of affairs. The Legates thereupon sent Commendone to see him and endeavour to come to some understanding. His embassy, however, had little success and he soon returned to Trent.

All turned now upon the action of France and the Emperor. On February 12, 1563, the Cardinal of Lorraine journeyed to Innsbruck to confer with Ferdinand; and there he found assembled with the Emperor, Maximilian, King of the Romans, Albert V, Duke of Bavaria, and the Archbishop of Salzburg. The Cardinal, in a memorandum which he presented to the Emperor, attributed the barren result of the Council to the fact that only matters which had been approved of at Rome were allowed to be decided at Trent. The overwhelming majority of Italian Bishops, and the fact that the right of initiative rested with the Legates alone, prevented any real reform. As a remedy the Cardinal suggested that the Ambassadors should have the right of making proposals directly to the Council, and that a larger number of non-Italian Bishops should be sent for to counterbalance the Italian majority. Above all, the Emperor should come in person to Trent and exercise his influence upon the Council.

Ferdinand, however, saw little hope in these proposals. It was a practical impossibility to find any other non-Italian Bishops who would go to Trent; and his own presence would give the papal party an opportunity of raising the cry that the Council was not free. To attempt to give the Ambassadors a right of initiative in the Council would only lead to the breaking up of the assembly. The Emperor was, in fact, fast losing hope of obtaining any good from the Council. The failure to obtain the concession of the chalice from the Council in September, 1562, was a great disappointment to him; and the slow progress that the Council had made since that time filled him with despair. At the beginning of March, 1563, he turned to the Pope instead of to the Council, in the hope of persuading him to bring about some effective reforms. The Pope threw all the blame for the delay upon the Council,

and especially upon the Spanish Bishops for raising theoretic and useless questions. In this way one country could be played off against another. The Papacy perceived, however, that Ferdinand's confidence in the Council was much shaken, and determined to send a Cardinal to Innsbruck to endeavour to alienate him from it still further.

Meanwhile at Trent still further delay was caused by the death of two of the Legates. The Cardinal of Mantua died on March 2, and Cardinal Seripando on March 17, 1563. Cardinal d'Altemps had returned to Rome some time previously; and Simonetta and Hosius did not care to act alone. They accordingly wrote to the Pope asking that two new Legates might be sent. The papal choice fell upon Morone and Navagero. The former was now a devoted servant of the Papacy and had reestablished his reputation for orthodoxy. He was, however, very acceptable to the Emperor and the moderate party still had some hopes of him. Navagero, on the other hand, was an open adherent of the curial party. The new Legates arrived at Trent on April 13, 1563. Morone, after an introductory discourse to the assembled Fathers, at once set out for Innsbruck. The Jesuit Father, Canisius, was with the Emperor and acted as the agent of the Roman Court in the Imperial entourage. This remarkable man, the first German Jesuit, was perhaps the ablest of the leaders of the Catholic reaction in Germany. Alike at Cologne, where he withstood the influence of the Archbishop Hermann von Wied, and at Ingolstadt, where in 1550 he became Rector of the University, he turned back the advancing tide of Protestantism. In 1552 Ferdinand, then King of the Romans, had summoned him to Vienna, and Canisius soon obtained considerable influence over him. At Ferdinand's request Canisius drew up a Catechism, which was translated into many languages and from which thousands were instructed in the rudiments of the Catholic faith. His *Summa Doctrinae Christianae* became the text-book of Catholic teachers and preachers throughout Germany. When Ignatius set up a Province of his Society in Upper Germany, it was only natural that he should place Canisius at its head. Directly Canisius heard of the arrival of Morone at Trent he sent urgent messages to him to come to Innsbruck as soon as possible. France and Spain had not yet agreed upon active cooperation with the Emperor; but with so many objects in common an agreement as to a course of action might occur at any moment. Canisius skilfully prepared the way for Morone. He pointed out to Ferdinand that by an amicable arrangement with the Holy Father he might obtain more than he would ever get from the Council. Ferdinand began to waver. His previous policy had ended in failure. Philip had been unmoved by his warning that reform of the rites and ceremonies of the Church, and not only of its discipline, was necessary to preserve Germany to the Church. By means of the Council he had achieved nothing. Morone now arrived with the definite offer of the concession of the chalice directly the Council.

should be terminated; and Ferdinand was won over. He agreed to give the Legates his support, and declared himself content with the minor reforms that the Legates proposed to put before the Council. The Papacy had thus gained the first step. It remained to come to terms with the Cardinal of Lorraine and Philip II.

Morone returned to Trent on May 27, and the discussions on the Sacrament of Orders were actively resumed. It was finally decided to avoid all mention of the disputed points as to the direct divine origin of episcopal authority and whether residence was "*jure divino*" or not. The decrees in this ambiguous form were published at the Twenty-third public Session on July 15, 1563. The difficulties of the Legates were, however, not yet over. Philip sent to the Council a new ambassador, the Count de Luna, who was instructed to demand anew the suppression of the formula "*proponentibus legatis*," and pressed forward the formulation of doctrine and a thorough reform of discipline. But the Emperor gave his support to the Legates, and the situation remained unchanged. National feeling now ran very high, and a dispute as to precedence between the French and Spanish ambassadors nearly brought the Council to an end. The state of tension is well illustrated by the interjection of a member of the Curialist party after a French prelate had denounced the abuses of the Roman Court: "*a scabie Hispana incidimus in morbum Gallicum.*"

Meanwhile efforts were being made to draw the Cardinal of Lorraine over to the papal party. A man of little sincerity, able and ambitious, he considered his own interests alone. After the death of his brother, the Duc de Guise, and the conclusion of the Treaty of Amboise, his position was not very secure at home; and in those circumstances the friendship of the Holy See was not to be despised. The papal diplomacy began its work early in the year 1563; and by the end of June the Cardinal was won over. Through his influence the French government agreed in August to the Council being brought to an end on the terms which the Emperor had accepted. The French Bishops meekly followed the lead of the Cardinal and ceased to oppose the policy of the Legates. The Spaniards alone remained, and agreement with them was not so easy. They were the puritans of the Council. Political expediency had no meaning to them. As they could not be bought, the only thing for the Papacy to do was to outmanœuvre them.

Direct appeals to Philip II to consent to the Council being brought to an end failed; so there was for the time nothing to be done but to allow the Council to occupy itself in matters which were comparatively of little importance. The Sacrament of Matrimony was discussed and its nature defined. The marriage of priests was forbidden without any opposition, though the Imperial ambassadors made a feeble protest. The question of clandestine marriages gave some trouble. They had admittedly given rise to great abuses, but the view that the Sacraments

were *ipso facto* operative (*ex opere operato*), drove many of the prelates to advocate their recognition. Finally, however, they were, by 133 votes to 59, declared invalid The work of reform was also continued. The Legates brought forward a series of decrees for the reform of the morals and discipline of the clergy. They involved the abandonment by the Curia of many valuable privileges, but at the same time they entrenched upon the rights of the State. To ecclesiastical tribunals powers were assigned which no government could afford to tolerate; the rights of patrons were interfered with; and immunities of the clergy, which had long been abandoned in practice, were again claimed. The Catholic Powers for once united in their protests, and the more extravagant claims were withdrawn in consequence. The conduct of the Cardinal of Lorraine in this matter shows how completely he had thrown in his lot with the Holy See. He had visited Rome in September, and his head was completely turned by the flattery which he received. He went so far as to advise the French government to submit to some of the extravagant claims put forth on behalf of the clergy; but his advice was not followed. The Council now resolved itself into chaos. The control of the Legates became little more than nominal. Pius himself had consented to a reform of the Cardinals being included in the general reform of the clergy; but the Italian Episcopate were not willing to see what they regarded as the privileges of their nation swept away. They succeeded in reducing the proposed reforms of the Sacred College to a mere shadow. The French ambassadors withdrew to Venice, hopeless of any good coming out of such an assembly. The firmness of the Spanish Bishops, however, prevented the scheme of reform being completely nullified by reservations and exceptions; and on November 11, 1563, the Twenty-fourth public Session was held, and the decree on matrimony and twenty-one out of the forty-two decrees on reform proposed by the Legates were promulgated, the remaining decrees being deferred to a later Session.

Everything was now subordinated to bringing the Council to an end. The Papacy ordered the Legates' to withdraw the proposals which infringed the rights of the State; and canons dealing with the remaining matters under discussion were drawn up with feverish haste. Purgatory, the Invocation of Saints, and Indulgences were hastily defined; and twenty more decrees of reformation were prepared. The Spanish ambassador and the Spanish Bishops maintained their protests to the end, but with no avail. A rumour that the Pope was dying hastened matters still faster. The Twenty-fifth Session was opened on December 3, 1563; and on December 4 the Council was brought to an end amid the acclamations of the assembled Fathers. 255 members of the Council signed its decrees, the four Legates, Cardinal Madruzzo and the Cardinal of Lorraine, 3 Patriarchs, 25 Archbishops, 168 Bishops, 7 Abbots, 7 Generals of Orders, and 39 who were absent represented by their proctors.

With the close of the Council of Trent the determination of the principles which were to regulate the reorganisation of the Catholic Church was completed. There followed, under the direction of the Papacy, an application and working out in detail of those principles, which was a task of many years; but the struggle was over and the battle won. Medieval theology had been emphatically restated. The scission of Christendom into two halves, each going its own way regardless of the other, was definitely confirmed. The spirit of dogmatic certainty, which drew its chief nourishment from Spanish soil and of which the Society of Jesus was the clearest expression, was to be the predominating influence for the future in the Church. Her doctrine was now completely articulated for the first time. Matters which the medieval Church had left to the speculations of the Schools were now authoritatively settled; and the Church was provided with a logical presentation of her position, definitely marking it off from all other circles of ideas. The issues had been put before the world, and it remained for Catholicism and Protestantism to fight the battle to the bitter end.

Though the triumph of the Counter-Reformation thus enabled the Church to present a united front as against Protestantism, it is not true that all opposition to the prevailing tendencies within the Church had been silenced. Many of the dogmatic decrees of Trent were as such a compromise. The great decree on Justification preserved room in the Church for those Augustinian ideas which the Church had never been completely able to assimilate, and which found subsequent expression in Jansenism. Great as was the influence of the Jesuits at Trent, they did not succeed in winning a complete triumph for their theology. This was not, however, of so great consequence as might appear; for all particular dogmas were beginning to sink into the background, compared with the one great principle that the use and wont of the Roman Church is law, and that to the Pope alone appertains the right to expound the teaching of the Church. The complete expression of this principle was impossible at Trent; the hostile elements were too strong; but the way was laid open. The papal supremacy over the Church received a new extension as the result of the work of the Council. The confirmation of the Pope was acknowledged to be necessary for the validation of its decrees. The supreme power in the universal Church was admitted to rest in the Roman Pontiffs. They were the Vicars of Christ on earth. The attempt to enunciate the direct divine authority of the episcopate was frustrated. The *Vaticanum* was only the logical outcome of certain elements in the *Tridentinum*.

The decrees on reformation successfully removed the worst abuses which had brought the Church and the clergy into contempt. The authority of the Bishops over their clergy, both secular and regular, was considerably strengthened; and means were provided for the removal of evil livers and the incompetent. The parochial clergy were compelled to

preach; and the whole discipline of the Church was improved. The practical reform, however, that was most far-reaching in its results was probably the establishment of seminaries for the education of the clergy in each diocese. This measure provided the Church with an adequate supply of trained men for its service, and removed the reproach which had formerly rested on the clerical state. At the same time it made the clergy a body more distinct from the laity than they had ever been before. It narrowed the interests of the clergy, and made them to a considerable extent the blind instruments of their superiors. Together with the system of celibacy, it separated the clergy from the ordinary social life of the people, and accentuated the division between the Church and the modern world.

The Council left to the Papacy the right of interpreting its decrees; and Pius IV hastened to enunciate this principle in the Bull *Benedictus Deus* (January 26, 1564), which confirmed its proceedings. No prelate was to publish any gloss upon the decrees of the Council or venture to interpret them without papal authorisation. In 1588 Sixtus V set up a special Congregation of the Council of Trent, to supervise the carrying out of its decisions. Meanwhile the Papacy anxiously endeavoured to persuade the Catholic Powers to accept in their entirety the decrees of the Council; but with the decrees on doctrine governments did not concern themselves. They were accepted throughout the Catholic Church, but with the decrees on discipline it was different. Even in the modified form which they received after the protests of the ambassadors, they infringed many ancient rights of the secular power in various countries, rights which it was not likely would be easily abandoned. In the end the decrees on discipline were only accepted in their entirety by the Emperor Ferdinand for his hereditary dominions, by Portugal, and by the King of Poland. France and the Empire never accepted them, while Spain and Venice received them with a reservation of their own rights which had practically the same effect. There were limits beyond which no modern State could allow the papal claims to go.

The tasks which the Council had left to the Pope were actively taken in hand. The Breviary and the Missal were revised, and a new edition of the *Corpus Juris Canonici* was published. A purification of Church music was begun. A commission of eight Cardinals was appointed on August 2, 1564, and in Palestrina a genius arose who became the founder of modern Church music. His famous *Missa di Papa Marcello*, performed before the commission on April 28, 1565, subordinated the music to the words, and substituted a dignified and masterly simplicity for the florid and decadent style which had hitherto characterised ecclesiastical music in Rome. The most important task left to the Papacy was however the preparation of an Index of Prohibited Books. So early as 1479 Sixtus IV had empowered the University of Cologne to inflict penalties on printers, purchasers, and readers of heretical books.

This was confirmed and extended by the Bull *Inter multiplices* of Alexander VI in 1501. At the Fifth Lateran Leo X in 1515 authorised the Master of the Sacred Palace to act as censor in Rome and the papal States; and the Inquisition in 1543 began to regard the censorship as one of its functions. The first lists of prohibited books were however drawn up in 1546 and 1550 at Louvain, in 1549 at Cologne, and by the Sorbonne between 1544 and 1551. The first papal Index was that of Paul IV, which was published in 1559. It was arranged alphabetically but under each letter came three categories. The first class consisted of the heresiarchs, all of whose writings were prohibited. This was a mere list of names. The second class consisted of writers, some of whose productions, which were enumerated, tended to heresy, impiety, magic, or immorality. The third class consisted of writings, chiefly anonymous, which were unwholesome in doctrine. The Index of Paul IV met with much opposition; and Naples, Milan, Florence, and Venice refused to print or enforce it. Pius IV modified it in 1561 by allowing the use of non-Catholic editions of the Fathers and other inoffensive writings to licensed readers, provided comments by heretics of the first class had been previously erased. No *Index Expurgatorius*, however, as distinguished from an *Index Librorum Prohibitorum*, was ever published officially at Rome. The harder work of pointing out particular passages which must be deleted was only undertaken in Spain. The Papacy contented itself with prohibiting books altogether or with a "*donec corrigatur*," of which nothing came.

The *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* of Paul IV was however condemned at Trent as a bad piece of work; and a commission was appointed to revise it. Ten rules to be observed were drawn up, but the work itself was left to the Papacy. The new Index was published by the Papacy in March, 1564, and is known as the Tridentine Index. The Index of Paul IV was improved, and some of its worst blunders removed. It was accepted by Portugal, Belgium, Bavaria, and parts of Italy. In 1571 Pius V set up a special Congregation of the Index distinct from the Inquisition; and in 1588 this body was empowered by Sixtus V to undertake further revision of the Index. Twenty-two new rules took the place of the ten laid down at Trent; and this new Index was published in 1590. Shortly after its publication, however, Sixtus V died; and Clement VIII restored the Tridentine rules and issued another Index in 1596. The materials collected for the Index of 1590 were used, though the Spanish Index of Quiroga published in 1584 was one of the chief sources. The Index of 1596 remained the standard, though additions were made to it, until the middle of the eighteenth century.

So far as the southern nations were concerned the Index achieved its work. The peoples who continued to adhere to the Catholic Church were cut off from the culture and science of the North, and a serious blow was dealt to human progress. It was impossible for such measures

to succeed ultimately; but for a time at any rate they were a serious hindrance to the advance of knowledge. The learned Jesuit Canisius, in a striking letter written to the Duke of Bavaria in 1581, printed in Reusch's great history of the Index, pointed out the futility of such measures. Repression by Edicts and Indexes could never succeed, construction was needed as well as destruction, and good authors must be provided to take the place of bad. A revival of Catholic scholarship, such as Canisius advocated, marked the close of the sixteenth century, a revival in which his own Order played a prominent part. Rome became again a centre of Christian learning; and the *Annals* of Baronius were worthy to stand by the *Centuries of Magdeburg*. New editions of the Fathers were prepared. In 1587 appeared the Roman edition of the Septuagint, and both Sixtus V and Clement VIII endeavoured to improve the text of the Vulgate. Historical scholarship ceased to be the monopoly of one party. The Jesuits were the equals in learning of their adversaries and their educational system was immeasurably superior. Protestantism in Germany was torn asunder by petty feuds; and by sheer force of superior ability and unremitting labour Catholicism was restored, first in the Rhine lands and then on the Danube. The story of this work, the success of which drove Protestantism to desperation and assisted to provoke the Thirty Years' War, is beyond our scope. It is sufficient to notice here that it was the fruit of that new Catholicism which emerged triumphant from the Council of Trent. Saintliness of life and the beauty of holiness were again exhibited to the world in a Carlo Borromeo and a Filippo Neri; while Protestantism was too often sinking into a time-serving Erastianism or developing an arid scholasticism of its own which quenched the springs of religious life.

Increased centralisation in government and strict definition of dogma made Catholicism after Trent a far more powerful fighting force than it had ever been before, but it was only at the price of drawing in its borders and limiting its sympathies. There is a curious likeness in essence, though in forms of expression they are poles asunder, between Puritanism in England and the movement of which Caraffa and Ignatius are the typical representatives in the Roman Church. Both alike subordinate the wider interests of humanity to the supposed requirements of religious faith. The sacred was rigidly marked off from the profane; and the culture of the world and its wisdom were banned and avoided as evil in themselves. The world was given up as hopeless, and the attempt to separate its evil from its good was abandoned. The work which Clement of Alexandria and Origen had begun for the ancient Church, and Thomas Aquinas and the great Schoolmen had achieved for the Church of the Middle Ages, was not done anew for the modern world. The true Renaissance was not absorbed into the circle of ecclesiastical ideas; and the medieval conception of Catholicity was limited rather than widened. The modern world, if not actually hostile to the Church,

grew up apart from it and by its side rather than under its influence. The kingdom of intellectual unity—which Raffaelle had depicted for Julius II on the walls of the Vatican—was not realised. The leaders of the Christian Renaissance had not the moral enthusiasm or the force of character necessary for the task. As the gentle Andrewes and the gracious Falkland had to give way before the sterner enthusiasm and the narrow pedantry of Laud, which in its turn fell before a more single-minded but still narrower creed, so Contarini and his associates abdicated the leadership to Ignatius and Caraffa. Neither Pole nor Morone had the spirit of martyrdom; and freedom could not triumph without its roll of martyrs. It was left to the sects in the future to vindicate the rights of conscience, and to extort by force from without what liberal churchmen had failed to achieve within the Church. There was a touch of the dilettante spirit in the aristocratic circles of the Catholic reformers in Italy at the opening of the sixteenth century which paralysed their efforts and enervated their moral fibre. The movement was too academic to influence the world effectively. Some of its members fell into the sins which they themselves had denounced, and like Cortese ended their lives in joining in the hunt for benefices. The rest contented themselves with a lower ideal as best they could, and stood helplessly aside. The Church was reformed and underwent a moral regeneration; but religious and intellectual freedom were left further off than ever. The issues at stake were, however, made clear, and the parties in the great struggle were definitely marked out. A *modus vivendi* between authority and liberty could not be found. Neither would tolerate the other, and Europe was doomed to be the battlefield of the contending principles. The sword alone could be the arbiter.

CHAPTER XIX.

TENDENCIES OF EUROPEAN THOUGHT IN THE AGE OF THE REFORMATION.

When the sixteenth century opens, the West, with the exception of Italy, is still medieval, distinguished by a superficial *uniformity* of mind, thinking ideas which it has ceased to believe and using a learned tongue which it can hardly be said to understand. When the century closes, the West, with the possible exception of Italy, now fallen as far to the rear as she once stood in the van, has become modern; its States have developed what we may term a personal consciousness and an individual character, have created a vernacular literature and a native art, and have faced new problems which they seek by the help of their new tongues to state and to solve. In Spain, the land of ancestral and undying pride, the humours of a decayed chivalry have been embodied in a tale which moves to laughter without ever provoking to contempt. In Portugal the navigators have created afresh the epic feeling; a new Iliad has been begotten, where swifter ships plough a vaster sea than was known to the ancient Greeks, where braver heroes than Agamemnon do battle against a mightier Troy, while travellers fare to remoter and stranger lands than those visited by Odysseus. In France, where the passion for unity is beginning to work like madness in the brain, Rabelais speaks in his mother tongue the praises of the new learning; Montaigne makes it the vehicle of the new temper and its cultured doubt; Clement Marot uses it to sing the Psalms of the ancient Hebrew race; John Calvin to defend and commend his strenuous faith; while Descartes, born in this century though writing in the next, states his method, defines his problem, and determines the evolution of modern philosophy, in the language of the people as well as in that of the learned. In England the century began in literary poverty, but it ended in the unapproached wealth of the Elizabethan age. In Germany, where the main intellectual interest was theological and confessional, Martin Luther gave the people hymns that often sound like echoes of the Hebrew Psalter; Kepler, listening to the music which nature reserves for the devout ear, discovered the unity which moves through her apparent disorder; and Jakob Boehme, though but a cobbler, had visions of higher mysteries than the proud can see. The Netherlands proved

their heroism in their struggle for independence, and their love of knowledge in the tolerant reasonableness that made them a home for the persecuted of all lands. In Scotland William Dunbar, Gawin Douglas, and David Lindsay shed lustre upon the early decades of the century, while in its later years Reformers like Knox and scholars like Andrew Melville trained up a people who had imagination enough to love and achieve liberty without neglecting letters. The thought which at once effected and reflected so immense a revolution can be here traced only in the broadest outlines.

We are met at the threshold by a two-fold difficulty—one which concerns the included thought, and another which concerns the thought excluded. The sixteenth century is great in religion rather than philosophy, and stands in remarkable contrast to its immediate successor, which is great in philosophy rather than religion. With the latter, the great modern intellectual systems may be said to begin; and to it belong such names as Bacon and Descartes, Hobbes and Locke, Spinoza and Leibniz, Gassendi and Malebranche. But without the earlier century the later would have been without its problems and therefore without its thinkers. The preeminence of the one in religion involved the preeminence of the other in thought; for what exercises the spirit tends to emancipate speculation and raises issues that reason must discuss and resolve before it can be at peace with itself and its world. Hence the thought whose course we have to follow is thought in transition, dealing with the old questions, yet waking to the new, quickened by what is behind to enquire into what is within and foreshadow what is before. But, while the thought that is to concern us may thus be described as moving in the realm of our ultimate religious ideas, the thought that is not to concern us moves in the realm of political and social theory. The two realms touch, indeed, and even interpenetrate; yet they are distinct. The ideal of human society is a religious ideal; but it is a consequence or a combination of religious ideas rather than one of the ideas themselves. Hence, though certain of the most potent thinkers of the sixteenth century occupied themselves with the constitution and order of human society, with the actual or ideal State both in itself and in relation to the actual or ideal Church, yet they must here be rigorously excluded, and our view confined to the thought that had to do with the religious interpretation of man and his Universe.

It is customary to distinguish the Renaissance, as the revival of letters, from the Reformation as the revival of religion. But the distinction is neither formally correct nor materially exact. The Renaissance was not necessarily secular and classical—it might be, and often was, both religious and Christian; nor was the Reformation essentially religious and moral—it might be and often was political and secular. Of the two revivals the one is indeed in point of time the

elder; but the elder is not so much a cause as simply an anteceden the younger. Both revivals were literary and interpretative, both imitative and re-creative; but they differed in spirit, and they diff also in province and in results. There was a revival of letters w could not possibly become a reformation of religion, and there w revival which necessarily involved such a reformation; and the two revi must be distinguished if the consequences are to be understood.

The roots of the difference may be found, partly, in the minds studied the literatures, and partly in the literatures they studied, tho even here the qualities, the interests, and the motives of the minds stand the more clearly revealed. The difference is better expressed racial than by a temporal distinction; the term "race," indeed, as used does not denote a unity of blood, which can seldom if ever e but unities of language, inheritance, association, and ideas. In sense, the Catholic South was in speech, in custom, in social tempe political and municipal institutions distinctly Latin; and for sin reasons the Protestant North may be termed Teutonic. Now of t two the Latin race was in thought the more secular, while the Teut was the more religious; but as regards custom and institutions Latin peoples were the more conservative, while the Teutonic were more inclined to radical change. And this is a difference which t respective histories may in some measure explain. The Latin r especially in Italy, was the heir of the Roman Empire, still a v memory and a living influence; its monuments survived, its pagar had not utterly perished; its gods were still named in popular spee customs which it had sanctioned and dreams which it had bego persisted, having refused, as it were, to undergo Christian bapt Italy was to the Latins as much a holy land as Palestine had bee the Crusaders, with graves and relics and shrines lying in every va and looking out from every hill; and these appealed all the more to imagination since ecclesiastical Rome was a reality and imperial Ron memory and a dream. The Eternal City was like a desolate widow yet tarried and yearned for the return of the Caesar who had been spouse

And if Rome lived in the dust of her ancient roads and the ruin her temples, the Italian peoples and States seemed singularly sugges of Greece Their republics and tyrants, their civic life and milit adventurers, their rich cities with their colonies and commerce, t rapid changes of fortune, their swift oscillations from freedom to bond and from bondage back to freedom, their love of art and of letters, t mutual jealousies and ambitions were Greek rather than Roman; ind at certain moments they might almost make us feel as if ancient Gr had risen from the dead and come to live upon the Italian soil. F then the Renaissance could not but be classical: not the product some accident like the capture of a city or the fall of an ancient dyna

but the inevitable outcome of minds quickened by the Italian air and made creative by the vision of a vast inheritance. The Teutonic mind, on the contrary, had no classical world behind it; its pagan past was remote, dark, infertile, without art or literature, or philosophy, or history, or any dream of a universal empire which had once held sway over civilised man. In a word, its conscious life, its social being, its struggles for empire and towards civilisation, its chivalry, its crusades, its mental problems and educational processes, all stood rooted in the Christian religion. Behind this the memory of men did not go, and into the darkness beyond the eye could as little penetrate as the vision of the man can trace the growth of knowledge in his own infant mind.

Now these differing conditions made it as natural that the Teutonic Renaissance should concern itself with the early Christian ideal as that the Latin should with the ancient classical literature; and, where they touched religion, that the one should be more occupied with its intellectual side and the other with its institutional; for where the Roman Empire had lived the Roman Church now governed. The literature which the Teutonic mind mainly loved and studied and edited was patristic and Christian; but the literature which the Latin mind chiefly cultivated was classical and pagan. The Latin taught the Teuton how to read, to edit, and to handle ancient books; but nature taught both of them the logic that binds together letters and life. As a consequence, the Latin Renaissance became an attempt to think again the thoughts, and live again the life, embalmed in the literature of Greece and Rome; while the German Renaissance became an attempt to reincarnate the apostolical mind. The Latin tendency was towards classical Naturalism, but the Teutonic tendency was towards the ideals of the Scriptures, both Hebrew and Greek. Among the Latins almost every philosophical system of antiquity reappeared, though in an instructively inverted order; but among the Teutons the field was occupied by theologies based on Augustine and Paul, while philosophy began as an interpretation, not of literary thought or societies, but of man, individual and social, as he had lived and was living.

Hence, in the region of belief the Latins were the more critical and the Teutons the more positive. The thought which the Latins studied was that of a world into which Christ had not entered, though it was one in which Caesar had reigned; but the thought which the Teutons cultivated had Christ as its source and God as its supreme object. The Latin Renaissance thus produced two most dissimilar yet cognate phenomena: intellectual systems affecting mainly the notion of Deity, and Orders like the Society of Jesus, organised for the work of conservation and reaction. On the other hand, the parallel phenomena produced by the Teutonic Renaissance were attempts either to revive the religion of the apostolic literature, or to found the Protestant Churches and States. What concerns us here is the new thought, and not the

new organisations; and these preliminary distinctions and discussions will enable us to set the Latin, or Classical Renaissance, in its true relation to the Teutonic or religious.

We begin with the most obvious of the influences exercised by the Revival of Letters upon the thought of the sixteenth century, viz., those concerned with grammar and what it signified, and with language as the creation and the interpreter of thought. It has often been said that the Church preserved the knowledge of Latin as a living tongue; but Lorenzo Valla (1406–57) would have said, if the tongue were still alive it were better dead. As a grammarian Valla held grammar to be higher than dialectic, for it took as many years to learn as dialectic took months, and he may be said to have discovered literary and historical criticism by executing with its help judgment on three famous documents, viz., the Vulgate, which he condemned as faulty in style and incorrect in translation; the Donation of Constantine, which he proved by its anachronisms to be late and false and forged; and the Apostolic Symbol, whose terms and clauses he showed could not be of apostolic origin. His criticism of these documents (we omit all reference to that of the pseudo-Dionysius) was prophetic and more potent in a later generation than in his own. Erasmus published in 1505 the *Annotationes* on the Vulgate, and in a dedication which served as a preface he compared Valla as a grammarian and Nicolas of Lyra as a theologian; and he argued from the errors which had been proved to exist in the version which the Church had in a sense canonised by use, in a way that was at once an apology and a call for his own edition of the Greek New Testament nine years before it appeared. In 1517 a copy of the *De Donatione Constantini Magni* came into the hands of Ulrich von Hutten, who published it, and with his usual careless audacity dedicated it to the Pope, whom he straightway proceeded to denounce as a usurper and robber. Later this was sent to Luther just as he was meditating his *De Captivitate Babylonica Ecclesiae*; and it strengthened his trust in the German people, confirmed him in the belief that the Pope was Antichrist, and fortified him for the daring deed of burning the Pope's Bull. The criticism of the Apostles' Creed indicated a method of discussing dogma which only needed to be applied to become a theory of development capable of dissolving the vast systems of the traditional schools. We need not be surprised that Calvin speaks of Valla as "an acute and judicious man, and an instrument of the Divine Will."

The Italian mind was simple in spite of all its subtle complexity, and in the Renaissance it was like the explorer who set out to find a new way to India and found a new world instead. It had no more typical son than Giovanni Pico della Mirandola. He was—if we are to believe his nephew and biographer—chivalrous, beautiful, radiant, a man it was impossible to see without loving, an artist who loved art, a thinker who

delighted in thought, a seeker whose passion it was to find the truth, and who would gladly have sold all he possessed to buy it. Born in 1463, he studied Canon Law at Bologna; then, first at Padua, and later at Paris, he cultivated philosophy. When only twenty-one he returned to Italy and read Plato in Florence under Ficino; three years later he travelled to Rome, where he drew up nine hundred theses, philosophical and theological, which he offered to discuss with the scholars of all lands, promising, if they came, to bear the cost of their journey. But heresy was discovered in some of the theses, and the disputation was prohibited. Later he devoted himself to a contemplative life, renounced the world, divided his goods between his nephew and the poor, saying that, once he had finished the studies which he had undertaken, he should wander barefoot round the world in order that he might preach Christ. He was a mystic; nature was to him a parable, history was an allegory, and every sensuous thing an emblem of the Divine. He magnified man, though he distrusted self; and as he believed that truth came only by revelation he felt bound to seek it from those who had thus received it from God. Hence he searched for truth, successively in Aristotle, in Plato, in Plotinus, and in the pseudo-Dionysius, who seemed to many, even after Valla had written, the source of the highest and purest truth. But as Pico said, philosophy seeks truth, theology finds it, but religion possesses it; and the truth which religion possesses is God's. Man can best discover it in the place where God has been pleased to set it.

Now, in his quest for truth and its purest sources, Pico heard of the Cabbala, and conceived it to be the depository of the most ancient wisdom, the tradition of the aboriginal revelation granted to man. And just then John Reuchlin, German mystic and scholar, found Pico. He was older in years but younger in mind. He had studied philology in Paris, law in Orleans, and he had lectured on Greek in Tubingen; he was then on his second visit to Italy, with all the mystic in him alive and unsatisfied. The God whom he wanted, the logic of the Schools could not give him; by their help he might transcend created existence, though even then what they led him to was only the boundless sea of negation. In Aristotle the impossible, in Plato the incredible, was emphasised; but in the region of spirit things were necessary which thought found impossible or reason pronounced incredible. The Neo-Pythagorean School saved Reuchlin from the tyranny of the syllogism and restored his faith. In this mood he came to Pico, and to his mood the Cabbala appealed; its philosophy was a symbolical theology which invested words and numbers, letters and names, things and persons, with a divine sense. But Reuchlin was more than a mystic with a passion for fantastic mysteries; he was also a scholar; and the idea that there were truths locked up in Hebrew, the tongue which God Himself had spoken at the Creation and which He had then given to man, compelled him to learn the language that he might read the thought in the words of

Deity. So he put himself to school under a Jewish physician, acquired enough Hebrew to pursue his studies independently, and, as a result, published in 1506 his *De Rudimentis Hebraicis*. He himself named this book a *monumentum aere perennius*, and history has justified the name. It helped to define and determine the religious tendencies in Teutonic humanism, to change the fanciful mysticism that had begotten the book into a spirit at once historical, critical, and sane. It practically made the Hebrew Scriptures Christian, an original text which could be used as a Court of appeal for the correction of the translation and of the canon which the usage of the Church had accepted and endorsed. Knowledge of the language thus made the interpretation of the Old Testament more historical and more ethical; it could now be read as little through the Gnosticism of the Cabbala as through the Roman associations of the Vulgate.

The event which took the Old Testament out of the hand of phantasy turned it into an instrument of reform; for if it is doubtful whether Protestantism could have arisen without the knowledge of the Old Testament, it is certain that without it the Reformed Church could not have assumed the shape it took. In all this, of course, specific dangers might lie for the scholar who could no longer freely use the allegorism of Alexandria to convey the New Testament into the most impossible places of the Old, and who was therefore tempted to reverse the process and employ the language and spirit of the Old Testament in the interpretation of the New. But these dangers were still in the future; for the present it will be enough to recall the story, told in an earlier volume, of the controversy between Reuchlin and Pfefferkorn, and of the burning of Reuchlin's books by the Inquisition. In consequence of this unjust treatment, the humanists addressed a series of letters, at once eulogistic and apologetic, to Reuchlin, which were published in 1514 under the title *Epistolae clarorum Virorum*. (The second edition in 1519 substituted "*illustrium*" for "*clarorum*.")

This book suggested to one of the younger and brighter humanists, John Jäger—better known as Crotus Rubeanus, Luther's "*Crotus noster suavissimus*," a professor at Erfurt—a series of imaginary epistles written by vagrant students in the execrable dog-Latin of the Schools, to Ortwinus Gratius, otherwise Ortwin de Graes, professor of *belles lettres* at Cologne, a man whom Luther in his most emphatic and plain-spoken style described as "*poetistam asinum, lupum rapacem, si non potius crocodilum*." The *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*, while describing the experiences of their supposed authors,—and it is here where the characters so humorously reveal themselves—praise Gratius as well as the divines and divinity of the Schools, and censure the "*poetae seculares*" or "*juristae*" who had eulogised Reuchlin. In their composition various scholars collaborated, notably Ulrich von Hutten, then ablaze with the enthusiasm for Germany and the passion against Rome which made the

strife a joy to his soul. "The prison is broken," he cried, "the captive is free and will return no more to bondage." "O century when studies bloom and spirits awake, it is happiness to live in thee!"

Strauss thought the *Epistolae* a supreme work of art, named them "*eine weltgeschichtliche Satire*," and placed them alongside *Don Quixote*, since they were pervaded by so excellent a humour as to be higher and better than any merely satirical production. There is here ground for ample and radical differences, but on one point there is none—the success of the satire. It deceived the very elect; the friars who were satirised saw the truth of the portrait and did not feel its shame, even though the men of serious mind, who could not be deceived, were offended. Erasmus did not love it; nor did Luther, who said "*Votum probo, opus non probo*," and named the author "*einen Hanswurst*"; but it made the Schoolmen ridiculous, and while they were laughed at Reuchlin was applauded. He died in 1522, six years after the *Epistolae* had appeared—the same year in which Luther published his New Testament—sorrowing over the lapse from the Church and from letters of his young kinsman, Melanchthon, and over the coming revolution which yet had in him a plain prophet and a main cause.

In 1516, two years after the first volume of the *Epistolae*, Erasmus' *Novum Instrumentum* appeared. The man himself we need neither discuss nor describe. He was a humanist, that is, his main interest was literature; but his humanism was German; that is, the literature which mainly interested him was religious. In an age of great editors he was the most famous; but he was not a thinker, nor a man who could seize or be seized by large ideas and turn them into living and creative forces. His greatest editorial achievements were connected not with the classics, where his haste and his agility of mind made him often a faithless guide, but with the New Testament and the Fathers of the Church. Religion he loved for the sake of letters rather than letters for the sake of religion. He had a quick eye, a sharp pen, a fine humour, and could hold up to man and society a mirror which showed them as they were. He was fastidious and disliked discomfort, yet he could make it picturesque and amusing. His letters are like a crowded stage on which his time lives for ever; and we can hear and see even as his ear heard and as his eye saw. We are, indeed, never allowed to forget that he is a rather too self-conscious spectator; and that while all around him men differ and he is a main cause of their differences, yet there is nothing he more desires than to be left alone to live as untroubled as if he had no mind. He is "so thin-skinned that a fly would draw blood"; yet, or possibly therefore, he is a good hater, especially of the ignorant mob, the obtuse and vulgar men who could not see or feel the satire within the compliment or the irony hidden in an ambiguous phrase.

He is one of the men whose unconscious revelations of himself have a nameless charm; we see him as a student whose very circumstances

remind him of his origin, *ortus a scorto* as his enemies said, impecunious, forced into an Order he did not love, thirsting for a knowledge hard to obtain, seeking it at home or in Paris, where life is fast while his clerical guardian is suspicious and his own temper self-indulgent. Then we are touched by the early struggles of a scholar who loved learning and good living, and neither liked nor acquiesced in the poverty which seemed his destined lot, though we may be offended by his complaints, which are too frequent to be dignified, and his appeals for help, which are too urgent to be compatible with self-respect as we understand it. His pictures of our gracious and spacious England, loved because it is so kind to the stranger—the seclusion and erudition of Oxford, the repose and learned activity of Cambridge, the regal Henry, the magnificent Wolsey, the devout Colet, the genial More, the statesmanlike yet thoughtful Warham, who can rule the Church and yet remember the scholars who serve it,—are of a sort which pleases the reader and which he loves to read. And if he desires first-hand knowledge of the manners and morals of a picturesque day, the miseries of the sea and the comforts of the shore, or the discomforts of continental travel with its strange bedfellows, crowded inns, dirty linen, and unsavoury food; or of the dignified society and refined art of living to be then found in the great Italian cities; or of Rome and Roman society under Julius II, where a warlike Pontiff and cultured Cardinals, the spirit of the Borgia and the temper of the Renaissance, make the capital of Christendom an epitome of the world; or of the hopes, the disappointments, and the sorrows of an editor with a zeal for letters and a passion for praise, who negotiates now with mean and now with open-handed publishers, and stands between three publics, one sympathetic and appreciative, a second suspicious and sore and critical, fearful lest he go too far, and a third exacting and insatiable, determined to compel him to go much further than he wishes; or of the Reforming men and movements, the strange and tempestuous Luther, the audacious and restless Hutten, the moderate and scholarly Pirkheimer, the conciliatory and reasonable Melanchthon, the heroic and magnanimous Zwingli, the learned and large-minded Œcolampadius,—then he will find this knowledge superabundantly in this vivid and entertaining correspondence.

Yet, if we would know Erasmus, he must be studied in his more serious works, as well as in his letters. There we shall find the clergy of all grades from the friar and the parish priest to the Pope, the superstitions and ceremonies, the pilgrimages and fastings, the distinctions in dress and food, the worship of relics and of Saints,—pilloried and satirised and killed, at least so far as ridicule can kill. And his lighter moods express his graver mind; and unless this mind be known there is no person in history to whom we shall find it harder to be just. He is a proud and a strong man, when questions are at issue for which he supremely cares; but he will seem to us indifferent or vain or weak where

the question is one for which he did not care, however much we may wish he had. And, curiously, where his strength as well as his weakness most appears is in his edition of the New Testament. The inaccuracies of his text, the few and the poor authorities he consulted, the haste of the editor, the hurry of the publisher, the carelessness of the printer, and the facility with which he inserted in the third and later editions a text like *1 John V. 7*, which he had omitted in the first and second, are all instances of weakness familiar even to the unlearned.

But the sagacity—which saw in the Epistle to the Hebrews a work instinct with the spirit but without the style of Paul, which doubted whether John the Apostle were the author of the Apocalypse, which discerned in Luke the Greek of a writer skilled in literature, which perceived in the Gospels quotations from a memory which could be at fault, or which inferred textual errors even where the authorities were agreed—is characteristic of the honest scholar and indicative of the courageous man. What is still more significant, is the deliberate way in which as an editor and exegete he repeats the views and reaffirms the arguments of his more occasional works. Stunica charged him with the impiety of casting doubt on the claims and the authority of the Roman See and of denying the primacy of Peter. The Church, Erasmus said, was the congregation of all men throughout the whole world who agreed in the faith of the Gospel. As to the Lord's Supper, he saw neither good nor use in a body imperceptible to the senses; and he found no place in Scripture which said that the Apostles had consecrated bread and wine into the body and blood of the Lord. Heathenism of life and Judaism of worship had come upon the Church from the neglect of the Gospel. Ceremonies were positive laws made by Bishops or Councils, Popes or Orders which could not supersede the laws of nature or of God. The priest who wore a lay habit or let his hair grow was punished; but if he became a debauchee he might yet remain a pillar of the Church.

These were brave things for a man so timid as Erasmus and so desirous of standing well with the authorities of the Church to say; and in saying them he was governed by this historical idea:—things unknown to the New Testament were unnecessary to the Christian religion; what contradicted the mind of Christ or hindered the realisation of His ends was injurious to His Church. This idea determined the attitude of Erasmus both to Rome and to Protestantism. He, indeed, honestly believed that where Lutheranism reigned there literature perished; and that to restore the knowledge of the New Testament was to bring back the mind of Christ, who was the one teacher God had appointed, and therefore the sole and supreme authority in His Church. Hence, his difference from Luther was as inevitable as his difference from Rome, and more absolute, for in the one case he differed from a man, in the other from a system. It has often been said that his *De libero arbitrio* enabled him to express his difference from Luther without expressing his agreement with Rome,

or recanting "his earlier criticism of ecclesiastical abuses." This judgment is both prejudiced and unjust. It is indeed certain that the book was written in the desire to dissociate himself from Luther, as well as in response to the appeal to write something against the new heresy; but it is no less certain that the book expressed a point on which Luther's scholasticism offended the humanism of Erasmus. The saying "*liberum arbitrium esse nomen inane*" seemed to him an "*aenigma absurdum*," and for this reason—it was unknown to the New Testament and the Apostolic Church. It might be Augustinian, it certainly was scholastic; but it was neither Biblical nor primitive. Erasmus, in short, wrote as a Greek and not as a Latin theologian, as a classical scholar and not as a Western divine. He could not have selected a point more characteristic of his own position. He would have the Christian religion known through its creative literature; he would not have it identified with the philosophy or theology of any school.

So far we have been occupied with the formal rather than the material side of thought; now we must consider the latter, or thought in its objective expression as at once evolved, governed, and served by the critical method.

We begin with the Latin Renaissance. Its thought grew out of the study of Classical literature, though it reversed rather than followed the sequences of the Classical mind. The one began where the other ended, in an eclectic Neo-Platonism, or a multitude of borrowed principles reduced by a speculation, more or less arbitrary, to a reasoned unity which was yet superficial; but it ended where the other began, in attempts to interpret the nature within which man lived, with a view to the better interpretation of man. Though the order of evolution was inverted, it was yet in the circumstances the only order possible. For the mind which the voice of literature awakened could only respond to a voice which was articulate and intelligible. The mind was old in speculation, though its problems were new, and its age was reflected in the solutions it successively attempted or accepted. It had been educated in schools where theology reigned while Aristotle governed; and it revolted from the governing minister out of loyalty to the reigning sovereign, whose authority extended over regions of too infinite variety to be administered by his narrow and rigid methods.

The literature which enlarged the outlook changed the mind; it could not think as it had thought before or believe as it had believed concerning the darkness and error of pagan antiquity. The light which dwelt in ancient philosophy broke upon it like an unexpected sunrise, which it saw with eyes that had been accustomed to a grey and creeping dawn. And this means, that Classical thought was seized at the point where it stood nearest to living experience, and yet formed the most expressive contrast to it. This point was where philosophy had done its

best to become a religion, and had tried out of its school to make a Church. Hence, the new mind in the first flush of its awaking turned from its ancient master, Aristotle, and threw itself into the arms of the Neo-Platonists. Gemistos Plethon, who took part in the Council of Florence, 1439, was intellectually the most potent of the Greeks who helped in the Renaissance. He regarded Aristotle as a westernised Mohammadan rather than as a Greek, a man who had indeed once lived on the Hellenic soil, but who had become an alien in race and an enemy in religion, speaking in the Latin schools ideas which he owed to a Moorish interpreter. So Plethon expounded to the awakening West Plato as the Neo-Platonists understood him, "the Attic Moses," the transmitter of a golden tradition which the secular Aristotle had tried to break and which ran back through Pythagoras to Zoroaster on the one hand and Abraham on the other. His philosophy was at once monotheistic and polytheistic; God was one and infinite, but He acted by means of ideas or spirits, or minor deities who filled the space between us and Him. As first and final cause He ordered all things for the best, and left no room for chance or accident. Providence was necessity and fate providence, the world in all its parts and life in all its elements were vehicles of a divine purpose. The soul of man was immortal; the doctrine of reminiscence proved that it had lived before birth and so could live after death.

Plethon emphasised in every possible way the differences between Plato and Aristotle, refusing to allow them to be reduced to a mere question of terminology. This teaching lifted men above the arid syllogisms of the schools, enriched their view of themselves and nature, of God and history, and gave reality to the ancient saying "*ex oriente lux.*" For it came more as a religion than as a philosophy; even the apparatus of worship was mimicked; ceremonies were instituted, holy or feast days were observed; celebrities became saints, before the bust of Plato a taper was ceremoniously burned. The neophytes underwent a species of conversion; Marsilio Ficino (1433–99) was said to have been called in his youth to be a physician of souls, and designated as the translator of the two great masters, Plato and Plotinus. Man was conceived as like unto God, and was named divine; his destiny was to seek eternal union with the God from whom he came. That God was the archetype of the universe, its unmoved mover and orderer, the ground of all our reasoning, the light of all our seeing. He knew the world from within when He knew Himself, for creation was only the expression of the divine thought, God as it were speaking with Himself, and man overhearing His speech.

The circle of those devoted to the study of this philosophy contained the most distinguished scholars of the day. Besides Ficino there stood his friends or converts, Angelo Poliziano, though his fame is mainly philological; Cristoforo Landino, the exponent of Horace, of Virgil,

and of Dante, who has given us a picture of Florentine society which recalls Plato's *Symposium*; Girolamo Benivieni, the poet who sang in praise of Platonic love; the architect, painter and man of letters, Leo Battista Alberti; Pico della Mirandola, of whose faith and fame and achievements we have already spoken; and above all the men of the Medicean House who founded the so-called Platonic Academy of Florence. This was rather a Society than a School, not an equipped and organised college, but an association of like-minded men who cultivated philosophy and professed to live according to the philosophy they cultivated. It added lustre to the reign of the Medici, helped to define its character, to fix upon it name and distinction. Under Cosmo and his son Piero, and especially under his grandson Lorenzo, it became the centre and sum and even source of Florentine culture. But the patronage of the House proved fatal to the thought for which the Academy stood; with the House it rose, lived in its smile, fell in its fall. Yet it did not fall before it had accomplished things that could not die. It revealed the world which the Church had extinguished and the Schoolmen superseded; it raised the reason that could speculate concerning truth above the authority that would legislate in its behalf; it taught men to believe that the truth lived in the soul rather than in books, that nature was beautiful and man was good, and that truth existed before Church or Councils and stood outside them both, and that man attains to the larger humanity by the study of that literature in which the truth adapted to his nature is best expressed. These were indeed notable contributions to the thought of the century.

But though Plato lived in the New Academy, Aristotle still reigned in the older Schools. He had been too efficient an instrument in education to be easily pushed aside; but the thought which is to shape living mind must not itself be dead. Hence the men, who were by birth as well as by discipline Aristotelians, set themselves to rejuvenate the ancient Master and change his obsolete speech into the language of the day. Three tendencies at once showed themselves, one which interpreted Aristotle in the sense and manner of Averroes; a second which construed him by the help of the Greek commentators, especially Alexander of Aphrodisia; and a third which laboured to reconcile him with Plato, some of the last-named going to Aristotle for their physics, but to Plato for their metaphysics. It soon became evident that the philosophical questions involved theology and raised issues affecting certain dogmas of the Church. These issues were more sharply defined in the Aristotelian than in the Neo-Platonic Schools and seriously alarmed the Church. How this was and with what reason, Pomponazzi (1462–1524)—Peretto, or little Peter, as he was affectionately named—will help us to understand.

Reverence for Aristotle had become in him a second nature; and though he writes poor Latin and knows no Greek, and is, as he said, in

comparison with his master but an insect beside an elephant, yet he desires to serve truth by interpreting his philosophy. He frankly emphasised its opposition to faith; and narrowly escaped being burned for his pains, though his books were not so fortunate. He said: "The thinker, who inquires into the divine mysteries, is like Proteus. In face of consequences he neither hungers nor thirsts, eats or sleeps; the Inquisition persecutes him as a heretic; the multitude mocks him as a fool." Doubt is native to him, and like Descartes he doubts that he may know; but, unlike Descartes, his doubt is more critical than speculative, more literary than philosophical. And if he has a doubt to express he dearly loves to express it in another name than his own, or shield himself behind some noted authority. Religions he conceives as laws instituted by lawgivers, like Christ or Mohammad, for the regulation of life. They are governed in their coming and going, in their bloom and decay, by time and space; and their horoscope can be cast just as if they were mortal beings. Christianity is proved true by its miracles, which are not impossible, though they have now ceased to happen and fictitious marvels have taken their place. Since religions are laws, they must promise to reward the righteous and threaten to punish the wicked; and as conduct rather than knowledge is their end they may use parables and myths, which, of course, need not be true. Man is like the ass which must be beaten that it may carry its burden; to teach him deep mysteries would be but to waste our breath. Nor are we to esteem him too highly or exhort him to become godlike, for how can man resemble a God whom he cannot know? As it is impossible to have natural grounds for a supernatural faith we must be content to hold it without reason, though it may be a gift of grace. If religion be moral then man must be free. And though his freedom may be incapable of rational proof yet it is a matter of conscious experience. This, indeed, may seem incompatible with Providence, which Aristotle conceived as general rather than particular, though we conceive it as a general made up of all particulars; but where philosophy is blind revelation may see, and it is better to trust it than to walk in darkness. The God who governs has created, and creation was willed in eternity, but happens in time, for Aristotle's idea of an eternal creation is sophistical. As the workman loves his handiwork so God loves all His creatures and wills their good. He has given to every being, not perhaps the absolutely best, but the best for it and for the universe, viewed in their complementary and reciprocal relations. For men supplement each other; what seems in and by itself a defect may become an excellency when seen from the standpoint of the collective whole. Man lives in humanity, humanity within nature, nature in God; and we ought to know all together before we judge any separately.

This is what would be called to-day a system of philosophical agnosticism, where man's ignorance becomes a plea, if not a reason for

faith; but what it signified to Pomponazzi we shall best understand by turning to his famous treatise on the Immortality of the Soul. The treatise is at once an attempt at the historical interpretation of Aristotle and a serious independent discussion. It is practically concerned with the question: How did Aristotle conceive immortality, as personal or as collective? It is as little soluble by the natural reason as the cognate question whether the world is eternal or created; in each case the problem as to the beginning holds the key of the problem as to the end. The Aristotelian Schoolmen had argued that the capacity of the soul to think the eternal and will the universal implied its immortality. But what is the soul? We cannot define it as thought percipient of the universal reason, for there can be no thought without ideas and no ideas without sense. The soul which lives within nature must develop according to natural law and in obedience to it. Now, we never find soul without body; and hence we must ask: how are these related? Not as mover and moved, else their proper analogies would be the ox and the waggon it draws, but as matter and form, *i.e.* without the body the soul could not be, for only through the body does man take his place in nature and realise his rational activity. Hence the human soul cannot exist without the human body, and must therefore be liable to the same mortality. And this conclusion is worked out in connexion with the moral doctrine that man is bound to act from love of virtue and horror of vice, and not from any hope of reward or fear of punishment, and so to act as to make all nature the better for his action. Reason, then, must conclude that the soul is mortal; but religion comes to our aid, and by teaching us to believe in the resurrection of the body resolves our doubts. Of this doctrine philosophy knows nothing, and so we can hold it only as an article of faith. This is in effect all Pomponazzi can teach us; religion and reason occupy opposite camps; neither can hold intercourse with the other. The truths of religion are the contradictions of the reason; the processes of the reason cannot serve the cause of religion The new scholasticism was a philosophy of reasoned ignorance where the cardinal verities of religion were the inconceivabilities of thought.

But here certain new forces which seriously affected the course and the development of Latin thought must be referred to and analysed. The ecclesiastical situation began to change, and the temper of the Renaissance changed with it. Thought had revived without conscious antagonism to the Church, though with the clear sense of opposition to the Schools and their methods. Churchmen had been forward in cultivating the new spirit, had encouraged and studied its literature, appreciated and promoted its art. But the Reformation, with its attendant incidents, made the Church suspicious of movements which might contain the seeds of revolt, while the Renaissance, always sensitive to

outer conditions, lost its spontaneity, becoming self-conscious and critical. Italy after 1525 became what the Moorish wars had made Spain, sullen in temper and jealous in disposition; she imitated Spanish methods and developed the Inquisition; in Rome, once careless and happy, the Holy Office was founded.

One of the earliest fruits of this change of feeling was the revival of Scholasticism and the increased influence of the Spanish mind upon the Italian. This revived Scholasticism, which was bred mainly in two Orders, both of Spanish origin, the Dominican and the Jesuit, and introduced by them into schools and universities, pulpits and Courts, learning and literature, was used to prove the necessity of the Church to religion, of the Pope to the Church, and of all three to society and the State. It had the learning which the Renaissance created, but was without its knowledge of antiquity, its sympathy with it, or its belief in finding there virtue and truth. Its purpose was indeed quite specific: to prove not that the Church was the mother of culture or mistress of art, but that she was the sole possessor of truth, the one authority by which it could be defined, authenticated, and guaranteed. The line of defence was bold: the Church was the creation of God, its government His express design, its rulers instituted by His immediate act. Secular rulers were but mediate creatures of God, appointed through the people and responsible to them; but spiritual rulers were His immediate creation and responsible to Him alone. And since the Church was the sole custodian of truth, it was not permissible to seek it without her or outside her; to profess to have found it independently was to be heretical; to obey what had been so found was to fall into the deadliest schism. The argument may have been narrow, but it was clear and strenuous; it may not have converted opponents, but it convinced friends. The Church became conscious of her mission; she was the guardian of thought, the guide of mind. She alone could judge what was truth and what error, what men ought to do or ought not to know. And as she believed so she acted, with results that are broadly written upon the face of history. The new Scholastics converted their own Church from the Catholicity which encouraged the Renaissance to the Romanism which suppressed its thought.

This, then, is what we have now to see; and so we resume our discussion of the thought which, as it faced the second quarter of the sixteenth century, began to feel the creeping shadow of the future. The change came slowly—for mind loves a violent catastrophe as little as nature—still it came and was marked by the rise of physical in succession to metaphysical speculation. The Neo-Platonic school had tended to a mystical and allegorical conception of the world, which implied a doctrine of the divine immanence and looked towards Pantheism. The Aristotelians, on the other hand, emphasised the ideas of cause and Creator,

conceived the universe as manufactured and limited, and God as transcendent, the two being correlated in the manner of the later deism. The one school was inclined to read nature through Deity, the other Deity through nature; but in each case nature took its meaning from the temper and fundamental postulates of the school. The traditional ideas were Aristotelian; the universe was geocentric; its main fact was the opposition of heaven and earth, with the involved antithesis of the higher or celestial element, and the four lower elements, earth, air, fire, water, all movement being explained from their attempts to effect a change of place.

This theory could not satisfy men who believe in a philosophy of immanence; and efforts were soon made to dislodge it. One of the earliest and most notable of these stands associated with the name of Bernardino Telesio (1508–80). He was a devout son of the Church as well as a zealous student of nature, and he disliked Aristotle for two reasons: first, because his philosophy knows neither piety nor a Creator; and, secondly, because he tried to interpret nature without questioning herself. Telesio's fundamental principle was this: nature must be explained in her own terms according to the method of experience and by the instrument of the senses. He conceived matter as a substance incapable of increase or decrease, more or less passive, yet susceptible of being acted upon by two forces, heat and cold, which, as causes, respectively, of expansion and contraction, produce all motion and all change. The heavens are the home of heat, and the earth of cold; and the constant effort of heat to illumine the dark and quicken the cold issue in a conflict whence come all the movement and variety of nature. The whole proceeds according to immanent laws and without the intervention of God. Nature is self-contained and self-sufficient; which however did not mean that she is without intelligence; on the contrary, there is a soul in things; each supplements and serves the other; mind lives in each, and works through the whole. Bacon saw in Telesio a return to Parmenides; others have seen in him an anticipation of Kant; others again have construed his principle "*non ratione sed sensu*" as if he were the first of modern empiricists, the forerunner of the sensuous philosophy, both English and French. In all these views there is a measure of truth. He clothed his doctrines in a guise more or less mythical, he could best conceive natural forces as personal, and he was never so ideal as when he meant to be most realistic. But he intended to be true to his principle, to construe nature not through metaphysics or theology, but from herself alone. It is this that makes him so significant in the history of thought, anticipating so much of what Bacon achieved, and places him, in spite of his crude and allegorical nomenclature, amid the forefathers of modern physics.

The speculations of Telesio did not stand alone; they were characteristic of his race and time. Italy, during what remained of the century,

seemed to forsake philosophy for science, but the science she cultivated was only disguised philosophy. A distinguished contemporary, a critic and a Platonist, was Francesco Patrizzi (1529-97), who agreed with the Telesian physics, but differed in his metaphysics: arguing that, as both the corporeal and spiritual light emanated from one source, each was the kin and correlate of the other, the effects being reduced to unity by the unity of the cause. Another and younger contemporary, who loved to think and speak of himself as Telesio's disciple, though he only saw the master after death, was Tommaso Campanella (1568-1639). His career has something of the tragedy which belongs to another and even more distinguished contemporary, Galileo Galilei (1564-1642), for whom he wrote while suffering imprisonment a noble though unsuccessful Apology. Like Galilei, Campanella lived after Copernicus, and was attracted by his sublimer and vaster view of the universe; and, like Copernicus, he was accused of heresy in consequence, spending, partly on account of his religious and partly on account of his political views, twenty-seven years of his life in prison. He was at first, and he probably remained, in spite of all the persecutions he endured, a faithful Catholic. While he followed Telesio, he was yet a most independent disciple. His science evolved into a philosophy of existence, whose highest truth is the Deity, and whose fixed first principle is the thought, the "*Notio abdita innata*," which is man. He was praised by Leibniz as one who soared to heaven, in contrast to Hobbes who grovelled upon the earth. Then as Telesio anticipated Bacon, Campanella anticipated Descartes. Though he does not use the formula he holds the principle of the "*cogito ergo sum*." Both are rooted in Augustine who said: "As for me, the most certain of all things is that I exist. Even if thou deniest this and sayest that I deceive myself, yet thou dost confess that I am, for if I do not live how could I deceive myself." One of the strangest things in connexion with the Catholic Campanella is the State, as described by him in his *Civitas Solis*. It is an echo of the Platonic Republic, without private property or family, with sexual intercourse publicly regulated and children owned and educated by the State, without a priesthood or public and positive religion, with philosophers as rulers and workmen as the true nobility. It was a noble dream, and shows how little physical speculation had killed ethical passion; the best interpreted earth was empty till it was made the home of happy and contented men.

Giordano Bruno (1548-1600) is of all the thinkers of the Latin Renaissance the most modern; in him science becomes philosophical, and philosophy speaks the language of science, confronts, defines, and enlarges its problems. As a man he is passionate, explosive, impetuous, vain, intolerant, and indomitable; and where these qualities are allowed freely to mix and express themselves it is very difficult indeed to be just. He himself says that "if the first button of one's coat is wrongly buttoned all the rest will be crooked"; and the event which set his

whole life awry happened when, as a lad of sixteen, he entered the Dominican Order. He early thought himself into heresy, and in his nature were fires which "all the snows of Caucasus" could not quench. In the effort to unfrock himself he became a wanderer, tried Rome, roamed over Northern Italy, crossed the Alps, and settled at Geneva, where he found neither the discipline nor the doctrine of the Reformed Church to his mind He then emigrated to Toulouse, where he studied the New Astronomy, tried to be at home and to teach the fanatical Catholics of southern France in a city where the Inquisition had an ancient history. He next moved to Paris, where he attempted to instruct the doctors of the Sorbonne and to make his peace with the Church; and, failing, he crossed to England, where he lived for awhile, wrote and published in London, and at Oxford claimed with much literary extravagance the right to lecture. To his Italian soul England was an uncongenial clime; he praised Elizabeth, as the Inquisition remembered later to his hurt; but he despised the barbarians over whom she ruled, and the ostentatious wealth and intellectual impotence of Oxford in her day.

From England he wandered back to France and thence to Germany, where he lectured at Wittenberg and eulogised Luther, who had "like a modern Hercules fought with Cerberus and his triple crown." He was elected to a professorship at Helmstedt; which he soon forsook for Frankfort. But the home-sickness which would not be denied was on him, and he turned back to Italy where bloomed the culture which was to him the finest flower of humanity, where dwelt the men who moved him to love and not to hate, whose speech and thought threw over him a spell he could not resist. He was denounced to the Inquisition; spent eight years in prison, first in Venice and then in Rome; and, finally, on February 17, 1600, he was sent to the stake. Caspar Scioppius, a German who had passed from the Protestant to the Roman Church, and who loved neither Bruno nor his views, tells us that when the prisoner heard his sentence he only said, "You who condemn me perhaps hear the judgment with greater fear than myself." And he adds that at the stake Bruno put aside a crucifix which was held out to him, and so entered heaven proclaiming how the Romans dealt with "blasphemous and godless men." A modern admirer sees, in the eyes uplifted to the blue, a spirit that would have no dark image stand between him and the living God.

It is customary now to describe Bruno's system as a form of pantheism. The term was not known then, or indeed for more than a hundred years after his death, which means that the idea is as modern as the term. Bruno was roundly named, just as Spinoza was later, an atheist, for men thought it was all one to identify God with nature and to deny His independent existence. The systems were indeed radically unlike; for while the one was a theophantism or apotheosis of nature, the other was

an akosmism or a naturalisation of God: in other words, Bruno started with nature and ended with Deity, but Spinoza began with Deity, his *causa sui*, *substantia*, or *ens absolute infinitum*, and reasoned down to nature. The antecedents of the one system were classical and philosophical but those of the other Semitic and religious. The historical factors of Bruno's thought were two, ancient or Neo-Platonic, and modern or scientific. His system, if system it can be called, may be described as an attempt to state and to articulate the ideas inherited by him in the terms of the universe which Copernicus had revealed.

He conceived this universe as infinite, and so rejected the ancient scholastic idea of a limited nature with its distinctions and divisions of place, its here and there, its above and below, its cycles and epicycles. But the universe, which has no centre and therefore no circumference, has yet a unity for consciousness, and wherever consciousness is its unity appears. And this unity signifies that order reigns in the universe; that its phenomena are connected; that individual things are yet not insulated; and this coherence implies that all are animated by a common life and moved by a common cause. And this cause must be as infinite as the universe; for an infinite effect can proceed only from an infinite cause, and such a cause can be worthily expressed only in such an effect. But there is no room for two infinities to exist at the same moment in the same place; and so the effect must be simply the body of the cause, the cause the soul of the effect. Hence the cause is immanent, not transcendent; matter is animated, the pregnant mother who bears and brings forth all forms and varieties of being. And the soul which animates matter and energises the whole is God; He is the *natura naturans*, Who is not above and not outside, but within and through, all things. He is the monad of monads, the spirit of spirits, carried so within that we cannot think ourselves without thinking Him.

There are, indeed, other expressions in Bruno; God is described as "the supersubstantial substance," as "the supernatural first principle," exalted far above nature, which is only a shadow of divine truth, speaking to us in parables. And this is possible, because in every single thing the whole is manifested, just as one picture reveals the artist's power and promise. But these things signify that he refused to conceive God as a mere physical force or material energy, and held, on the contrary, that He must be interpreted in the terms of mind or spirit. He hates, indeed, the notion that nature is an accident, or the result of voluntary action; and he labours to represent it as a necessity, seeking by a theory of emanation or instinctive action to reconcile the notions of necessity and God. Yet he does not conceive the best as already attained. Everything in nature strives to become better; everywhere instinct feels after the good, though higher than instinct is that which it seeks to become, the rational action that wills the best. Thought rises, like sense and instinct, from lower to higher forms. Heroic love, which desires the

intuition of the truth, drives us ever upwards, that we may attain the perfect rest where understanding and will are unified.

Bruno's speculations were those of a poet as well as a philosopher; and were in various ways prophetic. His death by fire at Rome signified that Italy had neither the wit nor the will to understand men of his kind; that for her the Renaissance had run its course, so that men must pursue its problems elsewhere in the hope of a more satisfactory solution. Descartes' "*de omnibus dubitandum est*," was but the negative expression of Bruno's positive effort after emancipation from authority, the freedom without which thought can accomplish nothing. Spinoza's *substantia*, with its twin attributes of thought and extension on the one hand, and Leibniz' monadology on the other, carried into more perfect forms the quest on which he had embarked. But to us he has an even higher significance: he is the leader of the noble army of thinkers who have tried at once to justify and to develop into a completer system of the universe the dreams and the doctrines of modern science. It is this which makes him the fit close of the movement, which began by waking the old world from its grave and ended by saluting the birth of the thought that made the whole world new.

We have not as yet approached the French Renaissance, which has indeed an interest and character of its own. It was, while less philosophical, more strictly educational, literary, and juristic than the Italian; and may be described as both Teutonic and Latin in origin. It entered the north and penetrated as far as Paris with the *Adagia* of Erasmus, published in 1500; but it reached the south from Italy, crossing the Alps with the gentlemen of France who accompanied their Kings on those incursions which had, as Montaigne tells us, so fateful an influence on the French morals and mind. Correspondent to this difference in origin was a difference in spirit and in the field of activity. In the north the Renaissance made its home in the schools, and worked for the improvement of the education, the amelioration of the laws, and the reform of religion, as names like Bude, Pierre de la Ramée, and Beza, may help us to realise, but in the south it was more personal and less localised, its learning was nearer akin to culture than to education, and it loved literature more than philosophy. Hence the forms it assumed in France can hardly be said to call for separate discussion here. Especially is this true of its more northern form; a better case might be made out for the southern. To it belong the great names of Rabelais and Montaigne; but their place is in a history of literature rather than of thought, though both affected the course of the latter too profoundly to be left unmentioned here.

Coleridge has said that Rabelais was "among the deepest as well as boldest thinkers of his age"; that the rough stick he used yet "contained a rod of gold"; and that a treatise could be written "in praise of

the moral elevation of his work which would make the Church stare the conventicle groan, and yet would be the truth, and nothing bu truth." These may seem hard sayings, utterly incredible if portioı his work are alone regarded, but accurate enough if the purpose drift of his teaching as a whole be considered. It has been well that the confession of faith of the *curé* of Meudon has far more n reality than that which Rousseau puts into the mouth of his Savo vicar. He believes that the universe needs no other governor tha Creator, whose word guides the whole and determines the nature, perties, and condition of each several thing. Pascal's famous defin of Deity, "a circle whose centre is everywhere and whose circumfeı is nowhere," is but an echo from Rabelais. And he can, with the w of the ancients and the best of the moderns, speak of the "great of the universe which quickens all things." La Bruyère describe work as "a chimera; it has the face of a beautiful woman, but the of a serpent." Yet surely the man who had to wear the mask buffoon that he might preach the wisdom of truth and love to his well deserves the epigram which Beza wrote in his honour:

> "*Qui sic nugatur, tractantem ut seria vincat,*
> *Seria cum faciet dic, rogo, quantus erit?*"

Montaigne is of all Frenchmen most thoroughly a son of Renaissance. He loves books, especially the solid and sensible well-flavoured books written in the ancient classic tongues, the men made and those who read them, and he loved to study man. He "*Je suis moy mesme la matière de mon livre.*" And he does not u stand himself in any little or narrow sense, but rather as the epi and mirror of mankind. The world in which he lived was not fri to the freedom of thought which was expressed in affirmative spee creative conduct, and so he learned to be silent—or sceptical. He seen men hate each other, willingly burn or be burned, out of lo God; and he was moved by pity to moralise on the behaviour of who were so positive where they could not know, and so little u stood the God in whom they professed to believe that they neveı what the love of Him bound them to be and to do. The man th studied and described was not abstract but concrete man, with a foibles and failings, limited in his nature but infinite in his v differing without ceasing from his fellows, and not always able to with himself. And man, so conceived, dwells amid mystery, h within him, and confronts it without. Custom may guide him not reason; for reason builds on arguments, whose every pos depends on another, in a series infinitely regressive. "*Les ho sont tourmentés par les opinions qu'ils ont des choses, non par les c mesmes.*" Where man is so ignorant he ought not to be dogm where truth is what all seek and no one can be sure that he i

i.e. where it is nothing but a mere probability, it is a folly to spill human blood for it.

God is unknown even in religion; as many as the nations of men so many are the forms under which He is worshipped. And when they try to conceive and name Him, they degrade Him to their own level. God is made in the image of man rather than man in the image of God; to the Ethiopian He is black, to the Greek He is white, and lithe and graceful; to the brute He would be bestial and to the triangle triangular. Man, then, is so surrounded with contradictions that he cannot say what is or is not true. Wisdom was with Sextus Empiricus when he said: "παντὶ λόγῳ λόγος ἴσος ἀντικεῖται. *Il n'y a nulle raison qui n'en ait une contraire, dit le plus sage parti des philosophes*" Where man so doubts he is too paralysed to fight or to affirm. Montaigne's sympathies might be with those who worked and suffered for a new heaven and a new earth; but his egoism inclined to the conventional and followed the consuetudinary. Prevost-Paradol termed him "*une perpétuelle leçon de tempérance et de modération.*" But this is a lesson which men of culture may read contentedly; while those who struggle to live or to make life worth living will hardly find in it the Gospel they need.

We turn now to the Teutonic Renaissance. Like the Latin, it began as a revolt against the sovereignty of Aristotle; but, unlike the Latin, its literary antecedents were patristic and Biblical rather than classical. They were, indeed, so far as patristic, specifically Augustinian, and, so far as Biblical, Pauline. With Augustine, the underlying philosophy was Neo-Platonic, with a tendency to theosophy and mysticism; with Paul, the theology involved a philosophy of human nature and human history This does not mean that other Fathers or other Scriptures were ignored, but rather that Paul was interpreted through Augustine, and Christ through Paul. This fundamental difference involved two others. In the first place, a more religious and more democratic temper, the religious being seen in the attempt to realise the new ideals, and the democratic in the strenuous and combatant spirit by which alone this could be accomplished. The thought which lived in the Schools could not resist the authority that spoke in the name of the Church and was enforced by the penalties of the State; but the thought which interpreted God to the conscience was one that bowed to no authority lower than His. In the second place, Teutonic was more theological than Latin thought. The categories, which the past had formulated for the interpretation of being, it declined to accept; and so it had to discover and define those which it meant to use in their stead. The God with whom it started was not an abstract and isolated but a living and related Deity; and man it conceived *sub specie aeternitatis*, as a being whom God had made and ruled. The very limitation of its field was an enlargement of

its scope; its primary *datum* was the Eternal God, and its secondary was the created universe, especially the man who bore the image of his Maker. This man was no mere individual or insulated unit, but a race—a connected, coherent, organic unity. The human being was local, but human nature was universal; before the individual could be, the whole must exist; and so man must be interpreted in terms of mankind rather than mankind in the terms of the single and local man. And this signified that in character, as well as in nature, the race was a unity; the past made the present, the heir became as his inheritance; and so any change in man had to be effected by the Maker and not by those He had made. And here Augustine pointed the way to the goal which Paul had reached: the will of God had never ceased to be active, for it was infinite; and it could not cease to be gracious, for it was holy and perfect; therefore, from this will, since man's nature was by his corporate being and his inevitable inheritance evil, all the good he could ever be or achieve must come.

This fundamental idea was common to the types most characteristic of the Teutonic Renaissance. It was expressed in Luther's *Servum Arbitrium*, in Zwingli's *Providentia Actuosa*, in Calvin's *Decretum Absolutum*. These all signified that the sole causality of good belonged to God, that grace was of the essence of His will, and that where He so willed, man could not but be saved, and, where He did not so will, no amelioration of state was possible. But this must not be interpreted to mean that man had been created and constituted of God for darkness rather than light, on the contrary, these thinkers all agree in affirming a universal light of nature, *i.e.* ideas implanted in us by the Creator, or, as Melanchthon phrased it, "*Notitiae nobiscum nascentes divinitus sparsae in mentibus nostris.*" In this position they were more influenced by Paul than by Augustine; with the Apostle, they argued that the moral law had been written in the heart before it was printed on tables of stone, and that without the one the other could neither possess authority nor be understood. But they also argued that knowledge without obedience was insufficient; and therefore they held God's will to be needed to enable man both to will and to do the good. But their differences of statement and standpoint were as instructive as their agreements. When Luther affirmed the absolute bondage of the will and Calvin the absolute decree of God, the one looked at the matter as a question of man's need, the other as a question of God's power; and so they agreed in idea though they differed in standpoint. Yet the difference proved to be more radical than the agreement. And so, when Zwingli said "he would rather share the eternal lot of a Socrates or a Seneca than that of the Pope," he meant that God willed good to men who were outside the Church or the covenants, without willing the means which both Luther and Calvin conceived to be necessary to salvation. It is through such differences as these that the types and tendencies of Teutonic thought must be conceived and explained.

Luther's Article of a Standing or Failing Church, Justification by Faith alone, is the positive side of the idea which is negatively expressed as the bondage of the will; and the idea in both its positive and negative forms implies a philosophy of existence which may be stated as a question thus: How is God, as the source of all good, related to man as the seat and servant of evil? God and man, good as identical with God and evil as inseparable from man, are recognised, and the problem is: how is the good to overcome the evil? The man who frames the problem is a mystic; God is the supreme desire and delight of his soul; and he conceives sin as a sort of inverted capacity for God, the dust which has stifled a thirst and turned it into an infinite misery. Now, Luther has two forms under which he conceives God's relation to man, a juristic denoted by the term "justification," and a vital denoted by the term "faith." "Justification" is the acquittal of the guilty: "faith is nothing else than the true life realised in God." The one term thus describes the universe as ethically governed, while the other describes man as capable of participating in the eternal life; and the two together mean that he can realise his happiness or his end only as he shares the life of God and lives in harmony with His law. The philosophy here implied is large and sublime, though its intrinsic worth may be hidden by the crudity of its earliest forms. The Lutheran doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* attempts, for example, to establish a kind of equation between the ideas of God and man. The person of Christ is a symbol of humanity; in it man can so participate as to share its perfections and dignity. Christ's humanity is capable of deity; God lives in Him now openly, now cryptically, but ever really; and His humanity so penetrates the Deity as to touch Him with a feeling of our infirmities and make Him participant in our lot as we are in His life.

This is the very root and essence of German mysticism, which gives to the German hymns their beauty and their pathos, which inspired the speculations of Brenz and Chemnitz, and which later determined Schelling's doctrine of "indifference" or the "identity of subject and object," and Hegel's "absolute idealism." If we read Boehme from this point of view, how splendid his dreams and how reasonable his very extravagances become! We are not surprised to hear him speak of the necessity of antitheses to all being, and especially to the life and thought of God, of evil being as necessary as good, or wrath as essential as love in God, who is the fundament of hell as well as of heaven, both the everlasting No, and the eternal Yes. He dwells in nature as the soul dwells in the body; there is no point in the body where the soul is not, no spot in space and no atom in nature where we can say, "God is not here." The man who is His image, who is holy as He is holy, good as He is good, is of no other matter than God. This may be Pantheism, but it is not rational and reasoned like Bruno's; it is emotional and felt, a thing of imagination all compact. It is born of the love that

loses the sense of personal distinctness and identity in the joy, not of absolute possession, but of being possessed. Boehme says that the processes of nature conceal God, but the spirit of man reveals Him; and how can it reveal a God it does not know? But the spirit that has never seen and touched Deity has never known Him or been so one with Him as to know Him as he knows himself. Here lives the very soul of Luther and the essence of all his thought. Boehme's friend and biographer describes him as a little man of mean aspect, thin voice, snub nose, but eyes blue as heaven, bright and gleaming like the windows of Solomon's temple. And he lived in harmony with lines which he wrote with his own toil-stained hand:

> "*Wem Zeit ist wie Ewigkeit*
> *Und Ewigkeit wie Zeit,*
> *Der ist befreit*
> *Von allem Streit.*"

Of course, such a change as Luther instituted could not but powerfully affect the minds of men. But certain concomitants must not be set down as effects; and the Peasants' War had its causes in centuries of German history, though among its occasions must be reckoned the ideas which the Reformation had thrown as it were into the air. But quite otherwise was it with the Anabaptist movement. While it sprang up and flourished in provinces and cities where Zwingli was potent as well as in places more expressly Lutheran, yet it belonged more specifically to the Lutheran than to the Reformed Church. To discuss its causes and forms would carry us far beyond our available space. It is enough to say · the principle of parity which it emphasised was more antagonistic to the one Church than to the other. Luther created his Church by the help of Princes; Calvin founded his on the goodwill of the people. The system that claimed fullest freedom for the individual could find less fault with the latter than with the former. And it is significant that the heresies which troubled the Lutherans were largely political and social, while those that afflicted the Reformed were mainly intellectual and moral. In nothing is the character of a Society more revealed than in the heresies to which it is most liable.

Zwingli and Calvin alike conceived God under the category of will, and construed man and history through it. Both held faith to be a consequence of, rather than a condition for, election; man believed because God had so decreed, and into His will every step in their upward or downward progress was resolved. Now, this emphasis on the will of God necessarily threw into prominence the ideas of God and will, with the result that the main varieties of opinion in the Reformed Church concerned these two ideas. If the will of God was the supreme and sole causality in all human affairs, and if the will always was as the nature was, it became a matter of primary consequence to know what kind of being God was, and what His nature and character. This question was

early and potently raised, and in a most significant quarter. Zanchius, himself an Italian, who so emphasised the will of God as to anticipate Spinoza and represent God as the only free Being in nature and the sole cause in history, wrote in 1565 to Bullinger warning him against being too easy in the matter of credentials of orthodoxy, as he had many heretical compatriots. "*Hispanus (Servetus) gallinas peperit; Italia fovet ova, nos jam pipientes pullos audimus.*" And it is curious that the attempts to find a simpler conception of God than Calvin's, or to modify his notion of the will by the notion of the Deity whose will it was, came mainly from men of Latin stock. Servetus was the son of a Spanish father and a French mother; Lelio and Fausto Sozzini, uncle and nephew, the one the father of the doctrine, the other of the sect, which respectively bear their name, were Italians, as were also Bernardino Ochino, who wrote a once famous book concerning the freedom and bondage of the will, "*the Labyrinth*," in which he argued that man ought to act as if he were free, but when he did good he was to give all the glory to God as if he were necessitated, and Celio Secondo Curione, who desired to enlarge the number of the elect till it should comprehend Cicero as well as Paul, while Sebastian Castellio, who is described by some contemporaries as French, though by others as Italian—as a matter of fact he was born in a Savoyard village not far from Geneva—argued that as God is good His will must be the same, and if all had happened according to it there could have been no sin. These views may be regarded as the recrudescence of the Latin Renaissance in the Reformed Church, and are marked as attempts to bring in a humaner and sweeter conception of God. They failed, possibly because of the severity and efficiency of the Reformed legislation, or possibly because they did not reckon with the Augustinian sense of sin, or most probably for reasons which were both political and intellectual. It is indeed strange, that positions so strongly rational and so well and powerfully argued should not have been maintained and crystallised into important religious societies; but as Boehme helps us to see, the man who knows himself to be evil expects and appreciates wrath as well as mercy in God. This may be the reason why the attempts made by some of the finest minds in the sixteenth century to soften the severer ideas of Deity seemed to their contemporaries heresies, and seem to the student of history ineffective failures.

The problem was soon attacked from another side. The field in which the will of God was exercised was the soul of man. That will concerned, therefore, him and his acts; if these acts were done because God had so determined, then two consequences followed; the acts would show the quality of the will, and the man would not be consciously free, would know himself an instrument rather than an agent. The criticism from these points of view was mainly northern; those who urged it did so in the interests of man and morality. In Calvin's own lifetime the doctrine of foreordination, or of the operation of the Divine will in its

relation to human affairs, was assailed by two men—Albert Pighius, a Catholic from the Netherlands, and Jérome Hermes Bolsec, a Parisian, an unfrocked Carmelite monk, who had turned physician, and had for a time been closely attached to Calvin. The former argued that if God was the absolute cause of all events and acts, then to Him we owed, not only the goodness of the good, but the wickedness of the wicked; the second, that if faith is made the consequence rather than the condition of election, then God must be charged with partiality. But towards the end of the century a more serious movement took place. The question of the Divine will had exercised the Reformed theologians, especially as criticism had compelled them to consider it in relation to sin as well as to salvation, *i.e.* both as to the causation of the state from which man was to be saved, and as to his deliverance from it. Certain of the more vigorous Reformed divines, including Beza himself, said that the decree in date precedes the Fall, for what was first in the Divine intention is last in execution; the first thing was the decree to save, but if man is to be saved he must first be lost; hence the Fall is decreed as a consequence of the decreed Salvation. But the milder divines said that the decree of God takes the existence of sin for granted, deals with man as fallen, and elects or rejects him for reasons we cannot perceive, though it clearly knows and regards. The former were known by the name of supralapsarians, and the latter by the name of sublapsarians. In the seventeenth century an acute and effective criticism was directed against both forms of the belief, which, although it falls beyond our scope, must receive passing notice here. Jacobus Arminius (Jakob Herman), a Dutch preacher and professor, declined to recognise the doctrine as either Scriptural or rational. He held that it made God the author of sin, that it restricted His grace, that it left the multitudes outside without hope, that it condemned multitudes for believing the truth, viz. that for them no salvation was either intended or provided in Christ, and it gave an absolutely false security to those who believed themselves to be the elect of God. The criticism was too rational to be cogent, for it was, as it were, an assertion of the rights of man over against the sovereignty of God. And it involved the men who pursued it in the political controversies and conflicts of the time. The Arminians were most successful when the argument proceeded on principles supplied by the conscience and the consciousness of man, and the Calvinists when they argued from the majesty and the might of God. But if the Arminians were dialectically victors, they were politically vanquished. The men who organised authority in Holland proved stronger than those who pleaded and suffered for freedom.

There are still large fields of thought to be traversed before we can do even approximate justice to the mind of Protestantism; but our space is exhausted. All we can now do is to drop a hint as to what was intended; we should have wished to sketch the Renaissance that followed

the Reformation as fully as the literary Revival which preceded it. Theodore Beza is a man whose fame as a Genevan legislator and divine has eclipsed his name as a scholar and educator; but it ought not to be forgotten that he was an elegant humanist before he became a convinced reformer and his most fruitful work was done in the provinces of sacred learning and exegesis. The Estiennes, Robert and Henry, are potent names in the history of Greek and Roman letters; they accomplished much for the languages and the literatures which they loved;—Robert, in particular, standing out as a devoted friend of religion and of science, for both of which he made immense sacrifices. Our *textus receptus* and its division into verses are witnesses to his zeal. Joseph Scaliger and Isaac Casaubon had the merit of awakening the envy, which was but inverted admiration, and the supple hate, which was like the regret of the forsaken, of the society whose mission it was to roll back the advancing tide of the freer thought that had come to quicken interest in letters; while Gerard Jan Vossius construed the classical mythology through religion, and both through Old Testament history in a way that contributed to form comparative science in the regions of thought, religion, and language. Protestant scholars had a larger and more realistic way of looking at classical problems than the men of the earlier Renaissance, and by its dissociation from polity and custom Teutonic thought even while it seems narrower in scope, is yet far wider in outlook and interest than Latin. It goes into a more distant past, and rises to higher altitudes. It came as a revolt, but it grew into a development; it continued free from the authority that would have suppressed it, and used its freedom to achieve results which the more fettered Latin mind panted after in vain. France continued in the seventeenth century the literary activity of Italy in the sixteenth, but speculation loves freedom, and refused to live where it could not be free. The events, which emancipated England from monotonous uniformity in religion, set the problems that have been the main factors in her historical development, and the chief causes of her philosophical activity and her literary greatness. Modern thought is the achievement of Northern and Central Europe, but it is the possession of universal man.

CHAPTERS I, II, AND III.

MEDICEAN ROME AND HABSBURG AND VALOIS.

BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

Armstrong, E. Charles V. 2 vols. London. 1902
Franklin, A. Les Sources de l'Histoire de France. Paris. 1877.
Langlois, C. V. and Stein, H. Les Archives de l'Histoire de France. Paris. 1893.
Manno, A. Bibliografia storica della monarchia de Savoia. Turin. 1884 etc.
Mazzatinti, G. Gli archivi della Storia d' Italia. Rocca S. Casciano. 1897–8. (In progress.)
Monod, G. Bibliographie de l'Histoire de France Paris. 1888.
Pastor, L. Geschichte der Papste. Vol III Freiburg i. B. 1895. Translated by F. I. Antrobus. Vols. V and VI. London 1891.
Pirenne, H. Bibliographie de l'histoire de Belgique. 2nd ed. Brussels, 1902.

PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS.

Albèri, E. Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti. Series I, 1, 2, 3, 4, 6. Series II, 1, 2, 5. Florence 1846–62.
Boislisle, A. M. de. Chambre des Comptes de Paris. Pièces justificatives pour servir à l'histoire des premiers présidents. 1506–1791. Paris. 1893.
Charles V.
Bradford, W. Correspondence of the Emperor Charles V and his ambassadors...from.. Vienna. Edited by W Bradford London. 1850.
Casanova, E. Lettere di Carlo V a Clemente VII. 1527–33 Florence. 1893.
Döllinger, J. J. Beitrage zur politischen, kirchlichen, und Kultur-Geschichte. Vols. I, II. Ratisbon. 1862.
Gachard, P. Correspondance de Charles Quint et d'Adrian VI. Brussels. 1859.
Kervyn de Lettenhove. Commentaires de Charles Quint. A revision of a Portuguese translation of the Spanish original. Brussels. 1862.
Lanz, K. Correspondenz des Kaisers Karl V. Aus dem koniglichen Archiv und der Bibliothèque de Bourgogne zu Brussel. Leipzig. 1844–6.
—— Staatspapiere zur Gesch. Karls V. Aus der Bibl. de Bourgogne. Stuttgart. 1845.
—— Aktenstücke zur Gesch. Karls V. Aus dem k. k. Hof- und Staatsarchiv zu Wien. Monumenta Habsburgica. Part II.
Clement VII. La politica di Clemente VII, fino al sacco di Roma. Secondo i documenti Vaticani. Rome. 1884.

Collection des documents inédits de l'Histoire de France.

xxxvi. Négociations de la *France* avec la *Toscane*. Edd. G. Canestrini and A. Desjardins. Vols *II*, *III*. 1861-9

xliv. Négociations diplomatiques entre la France et l'Autriche durant les trente premières années du xvi[e] Siècle. Ed. le Glay 2 vols. 1845.

xlvi. Captivité du roi François I. Ed. A. Champollion-Figeac. 1847.

xlvii. Négociations de la France dans le Levant. Ed. E Charrière. Vols. I, II 1848.

xlviii Relations des Ambassadeurs Vénitiens sur les affaires de France au xvi[e] Siècle. Ed. N Tommaseo. 2 vols. 1838.

xlix. Papiers d'État du Cardinal de Granvelle. Ed. Ch. Weiss. Vols I–V. 1841-3

Lettres de Catherine de Médicis. Ed. H. la Ferrière. Vol. I (1533–63). 1880.

Diane de Poitiers (Diane de Brezé, Duchesse de Valentinois). Lettres inédites de Diane de Poitiers, publiées avec une introduction et des notes par G. Guiffrey. Paris 1866.

Documenti ispano-genovesi dell' Archivio di Simancas. Ed. M. Spinola etc. Atti della Società Ligure di Storia patria Vol. VIII, Fasc 1, 2

Farnese, Cardinal Lettere scritte a nome del Card. Farnese. Ed. A. Caro 3 vols. (IV–VI of Opere). Milan. 1807.

Francis I Catalogue des Actes de François I. 7 vols. Paris. Imprimerie nationale. 1887-96.

Fredericq, P. Corpus documentorum inquisitionis haereticae pravitatis Neerlandicae. Ghent. 5 vols, to Dec. 1528 1889–1903

Guiffrey, G. Procès criminel de Jehan de Poitiers, seigneur de Saint Vallier. 1867.

Laemmer, H. Monumenta Vaticana historiam ecclesiasticam saeculi XVI. illustrantia. Freiburg i B. 1861.

Laurent, C, and Lamure, J. Recueil des ordonnances des Pays Bas, 2[e] Série. 1506-1700. Brussels. 1898.

Leonis X, P. M., Regesta. Ed. Card Hergenrother. Freiburg i. B. 1884–5.

Loaysa, G de Cartas al Emperador Carlos V...... 1530–2 por su Confesor. Edited by G Heine. Berlin. 1848. German translation published separately.

Marguerite d'Angoulême. Lettres de Marguerite d'A. reine de Navarre. Published by A Génin. Société de l'Histoire de France 1841-2.

Molini, G. Documenti di Storia Italiana 1522-30. 2 vols. Florence. 1836-7.

Morone, G Ricordi inediti di G. Morone, Gran Cancelliere dell' ultimo Duca di Milano ... pubblicati del C. Tullio Dandolo... .. Milan. 1855.

Pacheco, J. F and Cardinas, F. de. Coleccion de documentos inéditos relativos al descubrimento y colonizacion de las posesiones españolas en America y Oceania. Madrid. 1864.

Pellicier, G. Correspondance politique de Guillaume Pellicier, ambassadeur de France à Venise Ed. A. Jausserat-Radel. Commission des Archives historiques Paris 1899.

Pieper, A. Die papstlichen Legaten und Nuntien in Deutschland, Frankreich und Spanien, 1550-9. Munster. 1897.

Ribier, G. Lettres et Memoires d'Estat. Paris. 1666.

Saige, G. Documents historiques relatifs à la principauté de Monaco. 1891.

Serristori, A. Legazioni di A. Serristori, ambasciadore di Cosimo I, a Carlo Quinto e in corti di Roma. Ed L. Canestrini. Florence. 1853.

Virz, C. Akten uber die diplomatischen Beziehungen der romischen Kurie zu der Schweiz, 1512–52 Basel 1895.

For State Papers published in England *see Bibliographies of Chapters XIII.–XVI.*

CONTEMPORARY HISTORIES, CHRONICLES, MEMOIRS, ETC.

Bardi, A. Carlo V e l' assedio di Firenze (1528–30). Arch. Stor. Ital. 1893.
Barrillon, J. Journal de Jean Barrillon, secrétaire du Chancelier Duprat, 1515–
Ed. P. de Vaissière for Société de l'hist. de France, 1897.
Belcarius, F. Historia Gallica, 1461–1581. Venice. 1581.
Bembo, P. (Cardinal). Opere. 4 vols. Venice. 1729. In Collezione dei Clas
Italiani. Vols. 55–66. Milan. 1808–12.
Bodin, J. Les six livres de la République. Paris. 1583.
Boyin, F. de, Baron du Villars. Mémoires sur les guerres de Piedmont. Pa
1607. Michaud et Poujoulat, x. Petitot, xxxiii–vii.
Brantôme, P. de Bourdeille, Sr de Edited by L. Lalanne. Soc. de l'Hist.
France. Paris. 1864–82.
Carloix, V. Mémoires de la Vie de François de Scepeaux, Sire de Vieillevil
1527–71. 5 vols. Paris. 1757. Also in Petitot, xxvi–xxviii.
Casa, G. della. Opere, i, ii. Venice. 1752.
Castiglione, B. Il libro del Cortegiano. Venice. 1528, etc.
Cellini, Benvenuto. Vita, da lui medesimo scritta. Naples. 1730. Rome. 1901, e
Translated by T. Roscoe. London. 1822. By J. A. Symonds. Lond
1888, etc.
Cimber, L. et Danjou, F. Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France. 1e sé
Paris. 1835.
III. Brief discours du siège de Metz.
Le discours de la prinse de Calais.
Histoire particulière de la Cour du roy Henry II (by Claude de l'Aubespin
Le siège et prinse de Thionville.
Cini, G. B. Vita del Signor Cosimo de' Medici. Florence. 1611.
Clementis VII Epistolae per Sadoletum scriptae. Ed. P. Balan. Monume
saeculi xvi historiam illustrantia. Innsbruck. 1885.
Coligny, G. de. Siège de Saint Quentin. Michaud, viii. Petitot, xl.
Cronique du roi Francoys premier. Ed. G. Guiffrey for Soc. de l'hist. de Fran
Paris. 1860.
Du Bellay, M. and G. Mémoires 1513–52. Michaud et Poujoulat, v.
Ferronus, A. Pauli Aemilii historiae continuatio usq. ad an. 1547 Paris. 155
Giustiniani, A. Annali della Repubblica di Genova. Genoa. 1537. Ed. V. Cane
2 vols. Genoa. 1854.
Gosellini, G. Compendio storico della guerra di Parma et del Piedmonte, 1548–
In Misc. di Storia Ital. xvii. Turin. 1878.
Grassis, Paris de. Il Diario di Leone X. Ed. M. Armellini. Rome. 1884.
Guicciardini, F. Opere inedite. Ed. Canestrini. 10 vols. Florence. 1856–67
—— Storia d' Italia. 4 vols. Milan. 1889.
Guise, F. de. Mémoires. Michaud et Poujoulat, vi. Paris. 1839.
Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris sous le règne de François I, 1515–36. Edited
M. L. C. Lalanne for the Soc. de l'hist. de France. Paris. 1854.
Jovius, P. Historiarum sui temporis libri xiv. 1494–1547. Florence. 1550–2.
—— Vita Leonis decimi. Florence. 1548, etc.
La Mothe Fénelon, B. de Salignac, Marquis de. Le voyage du Roy (Henri II,
France) aux pays bas de l'Empereur en l'an MDLIIII. Paris. 1554.
—— Le Siège de Metz en l'an 1552. Paris. 1553. Ed. F. M. Chabert. Me
1856. Michaud, viii. Petitot, xxxix, xl.
Louise de Savoie. Journal. 1476–1522. Michaud et Poujoulat, v.

Mameranus, N. Commentarius de ultima Caroli V expeditione, 1544, adversus Gallos suscepta. In S. A. Würdtweiss, Subsidia diplomatica. No. 305. x. Heidelberg. 1772–80.

Montluc, B. de. Commentaires et lettres, 1521–76. Michaud, VII. Ed. A. de Ruble, for Soc. Hist. France. 5 vols. Paris. 1864–72.

Nardi, J. Le Historie della citta di Fiorenza, 1494–1531. Ed. A. Gelli. 2 vols. Florence. 1858.

Navagero, A. Il viaggio fatto in Spagna et in Francia con la descrizione etc. Venice. 1563.

Paradin, G. Histoire de notre temps, 1515–56. Lyons. 1558.

Pierragues, A D Giornali del Principe d' Orange nelle Guerre d' Italia, 1526–30. Florence. 1898

Pitti, J. Istoria Fiorentina Archivio Storico Ital. Vol. I. Florence. 1842.

Quentin, E. Journal du Siège de Péronne, 1536. From MS. of Mᵉ Jean Dehaussy. Péronne 1897.

Rabutin, F. de Commentaires des dernières guerres dans la Gaule Belgique. Paris 1555–9. Michaud, VII. Petitot, XXXVII–IX.

Reisner, A. Historia Herrn Georgs und Herrn Caspars von Frundsberg. Frankfort. 1572

Relation des troubles de Gand sous Charles Quint. Ed. L. P. Gachard. Collection de Chroniques belges 1846

Rochechouart, G. de. Mémoires, 1497–1565. Michaud et Poujoulat, VIII.

Ruscelli, G. etc. Lettere di Principi. Venice. 3 vols. 1564– .

Salazar, P. de. Coronica del nostro emperador Carlos V. Sevila. 1552.

Sandoval, P. de. Historia del emperador Carlos V. 2 vols. Pampeluna. 1618–24 etc.

San Quentin, la batalla de. In Coleccion de Documentos inéditos para la historia de España. IX. Madrid. 1846.

Saulx-Tavanes, Gaspard de. Mémoires. 1530–73 Michaud, VIII. Petitot, XXVI–VIII.

Scheurl, Chr. Geschichtbuch der Christenheit von 1511–1521. J. C. F. Knaake, in Jahrbücher d. deutschen Reiches und der Kirche im Zeitalter der Reformation. Leipzig. 1872.

Sepulveda, J. G. de. De rebus gestis Caroli V libri XXX. Madrid. 1780.

Sleidanus, J. De statu religionis et reipublicae Carolo V Caesare. Augsburg. 1556. Ed. J. G. Bohmer. 3 vols. Frankfort. 1785.

Ulloa, A Vita del gran Capitano Don F. Gonzaga nella quale...si descrivono le guerre d' Italia, e d' altri paesi, 1525–57. Venice. 1563.

—— La vita dell' imperatore Carlo V e le cose occorse, 1500–60. Venice. 1560.

Varchi, B. Istoria delle guerre della Republica Fiorentina acccorse nel tempo che la Casa de' Medici s' impadronì del governo. 2 vols. Leyden. 1720.

Vettori, F. Sommario della storia d' Italia dal 1511–27. Archivio storico Italiano. Appendice. Vol. VI. 1842.

GENERAL HISTORY OF THE PERIOD.

Armstrong, E. Charles the Fifth. 2 vols. London. 1902.

Baumgarten, H. Karl der Funfte. 3 vols. (to 1539). Stuttgart. 1885–92.

Leva, G. di. Storia documentata di Carlo V. 5 vols.

Maurenbrecher, W. Karl V und die deutschen Protestanten, 1545–55. Düsseldorf. 1865.

Mignet, F. A. M. Rivalité de François I et de Charles Quint. 2 vols. Second edition. Paris. 1875.

Raumer, F. L. G. von. Geschichte Europas seit dem Ende des fünfzehnten Jahrhunderts. Leipzig. 1832–50.

Robertson, W. History of the reign of Charles V. London. 1769.

SECONDARY WORKS AND SPECIAL TREATISES.

France with Lorraine.

Bacon, J. Life and times of Francis I. London. 1829.
Belleval, R., Marquis de. Les fils de Henri II. La cour, la ville et la société de leur temps. Paris. 1898.
Claudin, A. Histoire de l'imprimerie en France aux 15e et 16e siècles. Vol. I. Paris. 1900.
Dupuy, A. Réunion de la Bretagne avec la France. 2nd vol. 1880.
Duvernoy, E. Politique des ducs de Lorraine dans leurs rapports avec la France et l'Autriche de 1477-1545. Nancy. 1893.
Faguet, E. Seizième Siècle. Études littéraires. Paris. 1894.
Fitte, S. Das staatsrechtliche Verhaltniss des Herzogthums Lothringen zum deutschen Reich seit 1542. Strassburg. 1891.
Gaillard, G. H. Histoire de François I, Roi de France. 7 vols. Paris. 1766-9
Griessdorf, H. C. J. Der Zug Kaisers Karl V gegen Metz. Hallische Abhandlungen zur neueren Geschichte. XXVI. 1891.
Hamy, P. A. François I et Henry VIII à Boulogne 1532. Paris. 1898.
Hanotaux, G. Études historiques sur le XVIe et le XVIIe siècle en France. Paris. 1886.
Issleib, S. Moritz v. Sachsen gegen Karl V bis zum Kriegzuge 1552. N. Archiv für Sachs. Gesch. VI. 1885
Jacqueton, G. Le Trésor de l'Épargne sous François I. Revue Historique. Paris. 1894.
—— La politique extérieure de Louise de Savoie. Chalon sur Saône, 1892. Bibliothèque de l'École pratique des hautes Études Fasc. 88.
La Ferrière, Comte de. Le XVIe Siècle et les Valois d'après les documents inédits du Brit. Mus. et du Record Office. Paris. 1879.
Lavisse, E. Histoire de France. Vol. V. Part I. Paris. 1902-3.
Madelin, L. Les premières applications du Concordat de 1516. Mélanges de l'École Française de Rome. Vol. XVII. 1897.
Martin, H. Histoire de France. Vols. VII, VIII. Fourth edition. Paris. 1878.
Michelet, J. Histoire de France. Vols. X, XI. Paris. 1835-56.
Paillard, C. and Hérelle. L'invasion Allemande en 1544. Paris. 1884.
Petit de Julleville, L. Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française. Vol. III. Paris. 1897.
Pimodan, G., Marquis de. La réunion de Toul à la France. Paris. 1880.
Pouy, L. E. F. La Bataille de Saint Quentin (1557) d'après le récit de Paré. Saint Quentin. 1875.
Rahlenbeck, C. H. Metz et Thionville sous Charles V. Brussels. 1881.
Ranke, L. von. Französische Geschichte, vorn. im 16. u. 17. Jahrh. Vol. I. Stuttgart. 1852-61. Vol. VIII of Sämmtliche Werke. Leipzig. 1874, etc. Translated by M. A. Garvey. Vol. I. London. 1852.
Rott, E. Histoire de la représentation française en Suisse. Paris. 1900.
Roy, M. Le Ban et l'Arrière-ban du bailliage de Sens au XVIe siècle. Sens. 1885.
Ruble, A. de. Le traité de Cateau Cambrésis. Paris. 1889.
Scherer, H. Der Raub der drei Bisthümer Metz, Toul, und Verdun, 1552. Hist. Taschenbuch 866. 1842.
Schlomka, E. Die politischen Beziehungen zwischen Kurfürst Moritz und Heinrich II von Frankreich von 1550 bis zum Vertrag von Chambord, 15 Jan. 1552. 1884.
Sismondi, Simonde de. Histoire des Français. Vols. XVI, XVII, XVIII. Paris. 1834.

Spont, A. Semblançay. La bourgeoisie financière au début du 16e siècle. Paris. 1895.
—— Marignan et l'organisation militaire sous François I. Revue des Quest. Historiques, July 1899.
Teulet, J. B. A. T. Relations politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Écosse au XVIe siècle. Bordeaux and Paris. 1862.
Trefftz, J. Kursachsen und Frankreich, 1552–6. Leipzig. 1891
Vachez, A. Histoire de l'acquisition des terres nobles par les roturiers dans les provinces de Lyonnais, Forez et Beaujolais du XIIIe au XVIe siècles. Lyons. 1891.
Weill, G. Les théories sur le pouvoir royal en France pendant les guerres de religion. Paris. 1892.
Zeller, J. La diplomatie française vers le milieu du XVIe siècle, d'après la correspondance de Guillaume Pellicier. 1881.

Rome and the Medici.

Balan, P. Clemente VII e l' Italia de' suoi tempi. Milan. 1887.
Brosch, M. Geschichte des Kirchenstaates. 2 vols. Hamburg. 1880–2.
Creighton, M. (Bishop). History of the Papacy during the period of the Reformation. Vol. VI. London. 1882.
Feà, C. Notizie intorno Raffaele, etc. e paragone relativamente dei meriti di Giulio II e Leone X sul loro secolo. Rome. 1822.
Gnoli, D. Roma e i Papi nel seicento. In La Vita Italiana nel seicento. Milan. 1895.
—— Descriptio urbis o Censimento della popolazione di Roma c. 1522. Archivio della Soc. Romana di Santa Patria. Vol. 17. Rome. 1894.
Hellwig, W. Die politischen Beziehungen Clements VII zu Karl V im Jahre 1526. Leipzig 1889.
Hofler, C von. Papst Adrian VI. 1522–3. Vienna 1880.
—— Wahl und Thronbesteigung des letzten deutschen Papstes, Adrian VI, 1522. Vienna. 1872.
Muntz, E. Les arts à la cour des Papes pendant le XVe et le XVIe siècle. 3rd part. Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome. Fasc. XXVIII.
—— Les antiquités de la ville de Rome aux 14e, 15e, et 16e siècles. Paris. 1886.
—— Les historiens et les critiques de Raphael. Paris. 1883.
—— Les collections d'antiques formées par les Médicis au XVI siècle. Académie des Inscriptions et Belles Lettres. Histoire et Mémoires. Vol. 35.
Nitti, F. S. Documenti ed osservazioni riguardanti la politica di Leone X. Archivio della Soc. Rom. di Santa Patria. Vol. 16.
—— Leone X e la sua politica secondo documenti e carteggi inediti. Florence. 1892.
Ranke, L. von. Die romischen Päpste. Vols. XXXVII–XXXIX of Sämmtliche Werke. Leipzig. 1894, etc. English translation by Mrs Austin. 3rd ed. 2 vols. 1847.
Renazzi, F. M. Storia dell' Università di Roma. 4 vols. Rome. 1803–6.
Roscoe, W. Life and Pontificate of Leo X. 4 vols. Liverpool. 1805. 5th edition. London. 1846.
Sugenheim, S. Entstehung und Ausbildung des Kirchenstaates. Leipzig. 1854.
Villa, A. R. Memorias para la historia del asalto y saques de Roma. Madrid. 1895.

Italy, Sicily and Savoy.

Baguenault de Puchesse. Négociations de Henri II avec le Duc de Ferrare (1555–7). Le Mans. 1869.
Baschet, A. La diplomatie vénitienne au XVIe siècle. Paris. 1862.

Beloch, J. Bevölkerungsgeschichte der Republik Venedigs.
Canale, M. G. Storia della Republica di Genova, 1528–50. Genoa. 1874.
Celli, L. Ordinanze militari d. Repubblica Veneta nel secolo xvi. Rome. 189
Cipolla, C. Storia delle Signorie Italiane—1530. Milan. 1881.
Claparède, T. Hist. de la Réformation en Savoie. Geneva. 1893.
Costanzo, A. di. Historia del Regno di Napoli. Aquila. 1581. Also in C lezione de' classici Italiani. Vols. 119–21.
Creighton, M. (Bishop). History of the Papacy, etc. Vols. v, vi.
Crespi, L. A. Il senato di Milano. Ricerche intorno alla costituzione del stato Milano al tempo di dominazione Spagnuola.
Ferrari, G Histoire des révolutions d'Italie. Vol. 4 Paris. 1858.
Grethen, R. Die politischen Beziehungen Clement's VII zu Karl V. Hanover. 18
Guicciardini, L. Il Sacco di Roma. Paris. 1644.
La Lumia, I. La Sicilia sotto Carlo V. 1862
Livi, G. La Corsica e Cosimo I de' Medici. Florence. 1885.
Loiseleur et Baguenault de Puchesse. L'expédition du Duc de Guise à Napl Paris. 1876.
Perrens, F. T. Histoire de Florence depuis la domination des Medici. Vol. Paris. 1890. Translated by H. Lynch. London. 1892.
Professione, A. Della battaglia di Pavia al sacco di Roma. Rome. 1890.
Randi, C. La guerra di sette anni sotto Clemente VII. Arch. della Soc. Rom Storia Patria vi, 3 and 4.
Reumont, A. von. Beitrage zur italienischen Geschichte. 6 vols. Berlin. 1853
—— Geschichte der Stadt Rom. 3 vols. Berlin. 1867–70.
Ricotti, E. Storia della Monarchia Piemontese. Vol. i. Florence. 1862.
Romanin, S. Storia documentata di Venezia. Vol. vi. Venice 1856.
Rossi, A. Francesco Guicciardini e il governo fiorentino, 1527–40. 2 v Bologna. 1899.
Segre, A. Una questione fra Carlo III Duca di Savoia et Don Ferrante Gonza 1550. Torino. 1896.
—— La Marina Sabauda ai tempi di Emanuele Filiberto. Rome. 1898.
Sozzini, A. Sienese war. Archivio Storico Italiano. ii. Florence. 1842.
Symonds, J. A. Renaissance in Italy. 7 vols. London. 1875–86.
Villa, A. Rodriguez. Italia desde la batalla de Pavia hasta el saco de Roma. Curiosidades de la historia de España. Madrid. 1885.
—— La Reina Doña Juana la Loca. Madrid. 1892.

Low Countries and Burgundy.

Alexandre, P. Hist. du Conseil privé dans les anciens Pays-Bas. Brussels. 18
Asch van Wijch, H. W., and others. De Slag bij St Quentin. Utrecht. 1891.
Biographie Nationale de Belgique. 16 vols. (to Pepyn). Brussels. 1866.
Blok, P. J. Geschiedenis van het Niederlandische Volk. Vol. ii. Bk Groningen. 1892 etc. Translated (in abbreviated form) by Ruth Putn New York and London. Vol. ii. 1899.
Borman, C. de. Les Échevins de la souveraine justice de Liège. Liège. 1900.
Fredericq, P. De Nederlanden onder Keizer Karl. Ghent. Willems-Fo Academy. 1885 etc.
—— Geschiedenis der Inquisitie in de Nederlanden tot aan hare herinrichtu onder Keizer Karl V, 1025–1520. 2 vols. Ghent. 1892–7.
Gachard, L. P. Collection des voyages des souverains des Pays-Bas. Vol. Brussels. Commission roy. d'Hist. 1874 etc.
—— Trois années de l'histoire de Charles V d'après l'ambassadeur vénit Navagero. Brussels. 1865.

Gomart. Siège et Bataille de St Quentin (1557). Saint Quentin. 1859.
Heidrich, P. Der geldrische Erbfolgestreit, 1537–43. In Beiträge z. deutschen Territorial- und Städtegeschichte. Kassel, 1895.
Henne, A. Histoire du règne de Charles-Quint en Belgique. 10 vols. Brussels. 1858–60.
—— Histoire de la Belgique sous le règne de Charles-Quint. 4 vols. Brussels. 1865.
Hove, A. van. Étude sur les conflits de juridiction dans le diocèse de Liège à l'époque d'Erard de la Marck. Louvain. 1900.
Juste, V. Charles V et *Marguerite d'Autriche*. Brussels. 1859.
Lamure, E Le grand Conseil des ducs de Bourgogne de la maison de Valois. Brussels. 1900.
Picardie, La guerre de 1557 en. Société académique de Saint Quentin. Saint Quentin. 1896.
Rachfahl, F. Trennung der Niederländer vom deutschen Reiche. Westdeutsche Zeitschrift. Vol. XIX, pt 2. 1900.
Reiffenberg, F. A. F. T., Baron de. Histoire de l'Ordre de la Toison d'Or. Brussels. 1850.

SPAIN.

Bonn, M. J. Spaniens Niedergang wahrend der Preis-Revolution des 16ten Jahrhunderts. In Brentano und Lotz, Munchner Volkswirthschaftliche Studien. 1896
Cappa, R. Estudios criticos acerca la Dominacion Española en America. 2nd edition. Madrid. 1888 etc.
Häbler, K. Die wirthschaftliche Blute Spaniens im 16ten Jahrhundert und ihr Verfall In *Jastrow*; Historische Untersuchungen, Heft I. Berlin. 1888.
—— Die Geschichte der Fuggerschen Handlung in Spanien. Weimar. 1895.
Helps, Sir A. The Spanish Conquest in America. 4 vols. London. 1855–61.
Lea, H. C. The Moriscos of Spain. London. 1901.
—— Chapters from the Religious History of Spain connected with the Inquisition. Philadelphia 1890.
Loubens, M. J. G. Essais sur l'administration de la Castille au XVI[e] siècle Paris. 1860
Ranke, L Spanien unter Karl V, Philipp II, und Philipp III. Vol. XXXIII of Sammtliche Werke. Leipzig. 1874, etc.

BIOGRAPHY.

Bouchot, H. Catherine de Médicis. Paris. 1899.
Cantini, L. Vita di Cosimo de' Medici. Florence. 1805.
Darmesteter, A. M. J. *Margaret of Angoulême,* Queen *of* Navarre. London. 1886.
Decrue, F. Anne de Montmorency, Grand Maitre et Connétable de France, à la cour...de François I. Paris. 1885.
—— Anne de Montmorency, Connetable et pair de France, sous Henri II. Paris. 1889.
Du Prat, A T., Marquis. Vie d'Antoine Duprat. Paris. 1857.
Dupré-Lasale, E. Michel de l'Hospital avant son élévation au poste de Chancelier de France. Paris. 1898.
Fabroni, A. Magni Cosmi Medicei Vita. 2 vols. Pisa. 1789–98.
Gachard, L. P. Retraite et Mort de Charles Quint au Monastère de Yuste. Acad. Imp. et Royale. Brussels. 1854–5.
Juste, T. Vie de Marie de Hongrie. Brussels. 1855.

La Mure, J. M. de. Histoire des Ducs de Bourbon, en forme d'annales sur preuves authentiques. 4 vols. Paris. 1860–97.
Lefranc, A. Marguerite de Navarre et le platonisme de la Renaissance. Bibliothèque de l'École des Chartes. Vols. LVIII, LIX. 1897–8.
Marillac, O. de. Vie du Connétable de Bourbon. Paris. 1836.
Moeller, C. Éléonore d'Autriche et de Bourgogne, reine de France. Paris. 1895.
Petit, E. Andrea Doria. Paris. 1887.
Robert, U. Philibert de Chalon, Prince d'Orange, 1502–30. Boletin de la R. Acad. de la Historia. July to September. Madrid. 1901.
Vaissière, P. de. Charles de Marillac, ambassadeur et homme politique...1510–60. Paris. *1896.*
Stirling Maxwell, Sir W. The Cloister Life of the Emperor Charles V. London. 1852 etc.
Zanoni, E. Vita pubblica di Fr. Guicciardini. Bologna. 1896.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Burckhardt, J. Die Cultur der Renaissance in Italien. Basel. 1860. 8th edition. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1901. Translated by S. G. Middlemore. London. 1878.
Cat, E. De Caroli Quinti in Africa Rebus Gestis. 1891.
Cerezeda, M. G. Tratado de las Campañas...de los ejércitos del Emperador Cárlos V desde 1521 hasta 1545. Sociedad de Bibliófilos Españoles. Madrid. 1873–6.
Ehrenberg, R. Das Zeitalter der Fugger. Geldkapital und Kreditverkehr im 16ten Jahrhundert. Jena. 1895.
Gebhart, E. Les origines de la Renaissance en Italie. Paris. 1879.
—— Études méridionales. Paris. 1887.
Geymüller, H. Baron von. Geschichte der Baukunst der Renaissance in Frankreich. 2 vols. Darmstadt. 1896–9.
Gossart, E. Charles Quint et Philippe II. Étude sur les origines de la prépondérance politique de l'Espagne en Europe. Mémoires de l'Académie Royale. Brussels. 1896.
—— Notes pour servir à l'histoire de Charles Quint. Brussels. 1897.
Gonse, L. La Sculpture Française depuis le XIV^e siècle. Paris 1895
Hofler, C. A. C. von Karls I Wahl zum Romischen Konig. Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Academie. 1873.
Kraus, F. X. Geschichte der Christlichen Kunst. Vol. II. Freiburg i. B. 1897.
La Vita Italiana nel seicento. Conferenze tenute nel 1894. Milan. 1895.
Müntz, E. Histoire de l'Art pendant la Renaissance. Paris. 1888– .
Niel, P. J. G. Portraits des personnages français les plus illustres du XVI^e siècle. Reproduits 1848–56 avec notices. 2 vols. Paris. 1848
Palustre, L. L'Architecture de la Renaissance. Paris. *1892.*
Rosler, R. Die Kaiserswahl Karls V. Vienna. 1868.
Turba, G. Ueber den Zug Kaiser Karls V gegen Algier. Vienna. 1890.

For Medicean Rome *see also Bibliography of Chapters XII and XVII, for* Habsburg and Valois *Bibliographies of Chapters V–IX.*

CHAPTER IV.

LUTHER.

(I) GERMAN SOCIAL LIFE AND POPULAR AND FAMILY RELIGION IN THE LAST DECADES OF THE 15TH AND IN THE EARLIER DECADES OF THE 16TH CENTURIES.

(A) CONTEMPORARY.

Barack, K. A. Zimmerische Chronik. 4 vols. 2nd ed. Freiburg i. B. 1881–2.
Chroniken der deutschen Stadte. 29 vols. Leipzig. In progress.
Gess, F. Die Klostervisitationen des Herzogs Georg von Sachsen, nach ungedruckten Quellen dargestellt Leipzig. 1888
Grimm, J. Weisthumer. 7 vols. (Vols. v–vii, edited by R. Schroeder.) Göttingen. 1840–2, 1866, 1869, 1878.
Habler, K. Das Wallfahrtsbuch des Hermann Kunig von Vach, und die Pilgerreisen der Deutschen nach Santiago de Compostella. Drucke und Holzschnitte des 15 und 16 Jahrhunderts, No 1. Strassburg. 1899.
Hasak, V. Die letzte Rose oder Erklarung des Vaterunser nach Marcus von Weida (1501) und Munzinger von Ulm (c. 1470). Ratisbon. 1883.
Hatzerlin, Clara. Liederbuch. Edited by C. Haltaus. Quedlinburg. 1840.
Liliencron, R. v. Die historischen Volkslieder der Deutschen vom dreizehnten bis zum sechzehnten Jahrhundert. 3 vols. and appendix. Leipzig. 1865–9.
Lorenzi, Ph. de. Geilers von Keysersberg ausgewahlte Schriften. Trier. 1881.
Munzenberger, J. Frankfurter und Magdeburger Beichtbüchlein. Mainz. 1883.
Sachs, Hans Fastnachtspiele. Neudrucke deutscher Literaturwerke, Nos. 26, 27, 31, 32, 39, 40, 42, 43, 51, 52, 60, 63, 64. Halle.
Thausing, M. Durers Briefe, Tagebücher und Reime. Vienna. 1872.
Wackernagel, Ph. Das deutsche Kirchenlied von der altesten Zeit bis zum Anfang des 17 Jahrhunderts. Leipzig 1865.
Weller, E. Repertorium typographicum. Die deutsche Literatur im ersten Viertel des 16ten Jahrhunderts (with two supplements). Nordlingen. 1864, 1874, 1885.
Zarncke, F. Sebastian Brants Narrenschiff. Leipzig. 1854.

(B) SECONDARY.

Binder, F. Charitas Pirkheimer, Aebtissin von St Clara zu Nürnberg. Freiburg i. B. 1893.
Binz, C. Dr Johann Weyer, der erste Bekampfer des Hexenwahns. Bonn. 1885–6.
Bruck, H. Der religiose Unterricht fur Jugend und Volk in Deutschland in der zweiten Halfte des funfzehnten Jahrhunderts. Mainz. 1876.
Cruel, R. Geschichte der deutschen Predigt im Mittelalter. Detwold. 1879.
Dacheux, L. Jean Geiler de Keysersberg. Paris and Strassburg. 1876.
Eye, A. von. Leben und Wirken Albrecht Durers. 2nd ed. Nurnberg. 1869.
Falk, F. Die Druckkunst im Dienste der Kirche, zunächst in Deutschland bis zum Jahre 1520. Vereinschrift der Gorresgesellschaft. Cologne. 1879.
—— Die deutsche Messauslegungen von der Mitte des 15 Jahrhunderts bis zum Jahre 1525. Vereinschrift der Gorresgesellschaft. Cologne. 1889.

Falk, F. Die deutschen Sterbebüchlein von der ältesten Zeit des Buchdrucks bis zum Jahre 1520. Vereinschrift der Görresgesellschaft. Cologne. 1890.
Flathe, L. Geschichte der Vorläufer der Reformation. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1835.
Freytag, G. Bilder aus der deutschen Vergangenheit. Vol. II, Pt ii. Aus dem Jahrhundert der Reformation. New ed. Leipzig, 1899. (An earlier edition was translated by Mrs Malcolm. London. 1862.)
Friedrich, J. Astrologie und Reformation, oder die Astrologen als Prediger der Reformation und Urheber des Bauernkriegs. Munich. 1864.
Gothein, E. Politische und religiose Volksbewegungen vor der Reformation. Breslau. 1878.
Hagen, C. Deutschlands literarische und religiose Verhaltnisse im Reformationszeitalter. 3 vols. 2nd ed. Frankfort. 1868.
Hansen, J. Zauberwahn, Inquisition und Hexenprozess etc. Histor. Bibliothek XII. Munich and Leipzig. 1900.
Hasak, V. Der christliche Glaube des deutschen Volkes beim Schluss des Mittelalters dargestellt in deutschen Sprachdenkmalern. Ratisbon. 1868.
—— Dr M. Luther und die religiose Literatur seiner Zeit bis zum Jahre 1520. Ratisbon, 1881.
Hofler, C. A. C. von. Denkwürdigkeiten der Charitas Pirckheimer. Quellensamml. z fränk. Gesch., vol. IV. 1858.
Kawerau, G. Caspar Guttel. Halle. 1882.
Keller, W. Die Reformation und die aelteren Reformationsparteien. Leipzig. 1885.
Krebs, J. Zur Geschichte der Heiligenthumsfahrten. Cologne. 1881.
Kriegk, G. L. Deutsches Burgerthum im Mittelalter. Frankfort. 1868, 1871.
Leitschuh, F. Albrecht Dürer's Tagebuch der Reise in die Niederlande. Leipzig. 1884.
Lichtenberg, R., Freiherr v. Ueber den Humor bei den deutschen Kupferstechern und Holzschnittkünstlern des 16 Jahrhunderts. Strassburg. 1897.
Lorenz, J. Volkserziehung und Volksunterricht im späteren Mittelalter. Paderborn and Munster. 1887.
Schuchardt, Chr. Lucas Cranachs, des aelteren, Leben und Werke. 2 vols. Leipzig, 1851-70.
Schulz, Alwin. Deutsches Leben im 14ten und 15ten Jahrhundert. Prague, Vienna, Leipzig. 1892.
Schwaumkell, E. Der Cultus der heiligen Anna am Ausgange des Mittelalters. Freiburg. 1893.
Scott, W. B. Albert Dürer, his Life and Works. London. 1869.
Uhlhorn, G. Die christliche Liebesthatigkeit im Mittelalter. Stuttgart. 1887. Cf. Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, IV, pp. 44 ff.
Ullmann, C. Reformatoren vor der Reformation. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Gotha. 1866. Transl. by R. Menzies. 2 vols. Edinburgh. 1855.
Walther, W. Die deutsche Bibelübersetzung des Mittelalters. Brunswick. 1889.
Wilken, E. Geschichte der geistlichen Spiele in Deutschland. Göttingen. 1872.
Zur Geschichte des Klerus. Allgemeine Zeitung. Oct. 28, 1873.

(II) MYSTICISM AND HUMANISM IN THEIR RELATION TO LUTHER.

(A) Contemporary.

Becker, D. J. Chronica eines fahrenden Schüler's oder Wanderbüchlein des Johannes Butzbach. Ratisbon. 1869.
Bocking, E. Ulrici Hutteni Opera. 5 vols. Leipzig. 1871. A supplement contains, Epistolae obscurorum virorum cum notis illustrantibus adversariisque scriptis. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1864, 1869.

Boos, H. Thomas und Felix Platter. Leipzig. 1876.
Gillert, K. Der Briefwechsel des Konrad Mutianus. Halle. 1890.
Muther, T. Die Wittenberger Universitäts- und Facultätsstatuten vom Jahre 1508. Halle. 1867.
Theologia deutsch. Critical edition by Fr. Pfeiffer. 4th ed. Gütersloh. 1900.

(B) Secondary.

Delprat, C. H. Verhandeling over de Broederschap van Gerard Groote. Arnhem. 1856.
Drummond, R. B. Erasmus. 2 vols. London. 1873.
Geiger, L. Renaissance und Humanismus in Italien und Deutschland. Berlin. 1882.
Grube, K. Gerard Groot und seine Stiftungen. Vereinschrift der Gorresgesellschaft. Cologne. 1883
Hering, H. Die Mystik Luther's im Zusammenhange seiner Theologie. Leipzig. 1879.
Kämmel, H. K. Geschichte des deutschen Schulwesens im Uebergange vom Mittelalter zur Neuzeit Leipzig. 1892.
Kampschulte, F. W Die Universitat Erfurt in ihrem Verhaltniss zu dem Humanismus und der Reformation. Aus den Quellen dargestellt. 2 vols. Trier. 1856, 1860
Krause, C. Helius Eobanus Hessus, sein Leben und seine Werke. 2 vols. Gotha. 1879.
Muther, T. Aus dem Universitats- und Gelehrtenleben im Zeitalter der Reformation. Erlangen. 1866.
Nichols, F. M. The Epistles of Erasmus from his earliest letters to his fifty-first year arranged in order of time. London. 1901.
Preger, W. Geschichte der deutschen Mystik im Mittelalter. 3 vols. (unfinished). Leipzig. 1874, 1881, 1893
—— Beitrage zur Geschichte der religiosen Bewegung in den Niederlanden in der 2ten Halfte des 14ten Jahrhunderts. Munich. 1894.
Prohle, H. A. Andreas Proles, Vicarius der Augustiner, ein Zeuge der Wahrheit kurz vor Luther Gotha. 1857
Reindell, W. Luther, Crotus and Hutten. Marburg. 1890
Riederer, J. B Nachrichten zur Kirchen- Gelehrten- und Büchergeschichte. 4 vols Altdorf 1764-8.
Roth, F. Willibald Pirkheimer. Halle. 1887.
Schwarz, B. Jakob Wimpheling, der Altmeister des deutschen Schulwesens. Gotha. 1875.
Schwertzell, G. Helius Eobanus Hessus. Halle. 1874.
Strauss, D. F. Ulrich von Hutten. 2 vols. 2nd ed. Leipzig. 1874. Translated and slightly abridged by Mrs George Sturge. London. 1874.
Wiskowatoff, P. v. Jacob Wimpheling. Berlin. 1867.

(III) LIVES OF LUTHER AND ORIGINAL SOURCES FOR INCIDENTS IN HIS CAREER.

(A) Contemporary.

Cochlaeus, J. Commentarius de actis et scriptis M. Lutheri...ab anno 1517 usque ad annum 1537. St Victor prope Moguntiam. 1549.
Cruciger, Caspar. Tabulae chronologicae actorum M. Lutheri. Wittenberg. 1553.

Faber, K. Dr M. Luther's Briefe an Allbrecht, Herzog in Preussen. Königsber 1811.
Förstemann, C. E. Neues Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche reformation. Vol. I (all published). Hamburg. 1842.
Kolde, Th. Analecta Lutherana. Gotha. 1883.
Leib, Killian. Annales von 1503–1523. (Vols. VII and IX of von Aretin's Beiträ zur Geschichte und Literatur.) Munich. 1803–6.
Loesche, G. Analecta Lutherana et Melanchthoniana. Tischreden Luther's und Au sprüche Melanchthon's. Gotha. 1892.
Löscher, V. E. Vollständige Reformations-Acta und Documenta. 3 vols. Leipzi 1720–9.
Luther, Martin. Werke. Kritische Gesammtausgabe. Weimar. 1883 etc. (Twen volumes have been published.)
Mathesius, J. Historien von...Martini Lutheri Anfang, Lere, Leben und Sterbe Nürnberg. 1570. Critical edition by G. Loesche. Prague. 1896.
Melanchthon, P. Historia de vita et actis Lutheri. Wittenberg. 1546. (To found in vol. VI of the Corpus Reformatorum.)
Myconius, Fr. Historia Reformationis, 1517–42. Edited by E. S. Cyprian. Leipzi 1718.
Ratzeberger, M. MS. Geschichte über Luther und seine Zeit. Edited by Ch. Neudecker. Jena, 1850.
Seidemann, J. K. A. Lauterbach's Tagebuch...die Hauptquelle der Tischred Luther's. Dresden. 1872.
Selneccer, N. Historia...D. M. Lutheri. Leipzig. 1575.
Wrampelmeyer, H. Tagebuch über Dr Martin Luther, geführt von Dr Conr Cordatus (1537). Halle. 1885.

(B) Secondary.

Berger, A. E. Martin Luther in kulturgeschichtlicher Darstellung. 2 vo Berlin. 1895.
Enders, L. Dr Martin Luthers Briefwechsel. 5 vols. Frankfort and Stuttga 1884–93.
Kolde, Th. Martin Luther. Eine Biographie. 2 vols. Gotha 1884, 1893.
Kostlin, J. Martin Luther, sein Leben und seine Schriften. 2 vols. 1875.
Lang, H. Martin Luther. Ein religioses Charakterbild. Berlin. 1870.
Lenz, M. Martin Luther. Festschrift zum 10 Nov. 1883. Berlin. 1883.
Lindsay, T. M. Luther and the German Reformation. Edinburgh. 1900.
Seckendorf, V. L. Commentarius...de Lutheranismo. Frankfort. 1692.
Seidemann, J. K. Erlauterungen zur Reformationsgeschichte Dresden. 1872.
Treitschke, H. von. Luther und die deutsche Nation. Preussische Jahrbüch November. 1883.

(IV) LUTHER'S LIFE UP TO THE BEGINNING OF THE INDULGENCE CONTROVERSY.

(A) Contemporary.

Constitutiones Fratrum Heremitarum Sancti Augustini. Nürnberg. 1504.
Kessler, J. Sabbata. Chronik der Jahre 1523–1539. Edited by Egli and Schoc St Gallen. 1902.

(B) Secondary.

Buchwald, G. Zur Wittemberg Stadt- und Universitätsgeschichte in der Reformationszeit. Leipzig. 1893.

Elze, Th. Luthers Reise nach Rom. Berlin. 1899.

Hausrath, A. M. Luthers Romfahrt, nach einem gleichzeitigen Pilgerbuche. Berlin. 1894

Jürgens, C. Luther von seiner Geburt bis zum Ablassstreit. 3 vols. Leipzig. 1846, 1847.

Keller, L. Johann von Staupitz. Leipzig. 1883.

Kohler, K. F. Luthers Reisen und ihre Bedeutung fur das Werk der Reformation. Eisenach. 1873.

Kolde, Th. Die deutschen Augustiner-Congregationen und Johann v. Staupitz. Gotha. 1879.

—— Friedrich der Weise und die Anfänge der Reformation mit archivalischen Beilagen. Erlangen. 1881.

Köstlin, J. Geschichtliche Untersuchungen uber Luther's Leben vor dem Ablassstreit. Theologische Studien und Kritiken for 1871, pp. 7–54. Gotha. 1871.

Krumhaar, K. Die Grafschaft Mansfeld im Reformationszeitalter. Eisleben. 1845.

Oergel, G. Vom jungen Luther. Erfurt 1899.

Paulus, N. Der Augustiner Bartholomaeus Arnold von Usingen, Luther's Lehrer und Gegner. In Strassburger theologische Studien, Vol. i, Pt iii. Strassburg and Freiburg. 1893

Richard, A. V. Licht und Schatten Ein Beitrag zur Culturgeschichte von Sachsen und Thuringen im xvi Jahrhundert. Leipzig. 1861.

(V) THE INDULGENCE CONTROVERSY.

(A) Contemporary.

Kapp, J. E. Sammlung einiger zum papstlichen Ablass, überhaupt...aber zu der... zwischen D. Martin Luther und Johann Tetzel hiervongefuhrten Streitigkeit, gehörigen Schriften, mit Einleitungen und Anmerkungen versehen. Leipzig. 1721.

—— Kleine Nachlese einiger...zur Erlauterung der Reformationsgeschichte nützlicher Urkunden. (Four parts.) Leipzig. 1727–33.

Mirabilia Romae. Nurnberg. 1491. (A critical edition by G. Parthey. Berlin. 1869.)

(B) Secondary.

Beringer, F. (Soc. Jes.). Der Ablass, sein Wesen und Gebrauch. 12th ed. Paderborn, 1898.

Bouvier, J. B. Treatise on Indulgences (translated by F. Oakley). London. 1848.

Bratke, E. Luthers 95 Theses und ihre dogmenhistorischen Voraussetzungen. Gottingen. 1884.

Brieger, Th. Das Wesen des Ablasses am Ausgange des Mittelalters, untersucht mit Rücksicht auf Luthers Theses. Leipzig. 1897.

Dieckhoff, A. W. Der Ablassstreit dogmengeschichtlich dargestellt. Gotha. 1886.

Gröne, V. Tetzel und Luther. 2nd ed. Soest. 1860.

Köhler, W. Dokumente zum Ablassstreit von 1517. Tübingen and Leipzig. 1902.

Korner, F. Tezel der Ablassprediger. Mit bes. Rücksicht auf kathol. Anschauungen. Frankenberg. 1880

Lea, H. C. A History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences in the Latin Church. 3 vols. Philadelphia. 1896.

May, J. Der Kurfurst Cardinal und Erzbischof Albrecht II von Mainz und Magdeburg und seine Zeit. 2 vols. Munchen. 1865, 1875.

(VI) FROM THE INDULGENCE CONTROVERSY TO THE DIET OF WORMS.

(A) Contemporary.

Balan, P. Monumenta Reformationis Lutheranae ex tabulis S. Sedis secretis 1521–5. Ratisbon. 1883–4.

Brewer, J. S. Letters and Papers, foreign and domestic, of the reign of Henry VIII. Vol. III. London, 1870.

Brieger, T. Aleander und Luther, 1521. Die vervollständigten Aleander-Depeschen nebst Untersuchungen über den Wormser Reichstag. Pt I. Gotha. 1884.

Kalkoff, P. Die Depeschen des Nuntius Aleander. 2nd ed. Halle. 1897.

Laemmer, H. Monumenta Vaticana historiam ecclesiasticam saeculi XVI illustrantia. Freiburg. 1861.

—— Meletematum Romanorum Mantissa. Regensburg. 1875.

Murner, T. An den grossmachtigsten und durchlauchtigsten Adel deutscher Nation (1520), edited by Ernst Voss. (No. 153 of Neudrucke deutscher Litteraturwerke des XVI und XVII Jahrhunderts.) Halle. 1899.

Wace and Buchheim. Luther's Primary Works. 2nd ed. London. 1896.

(B) Secondary.

Albert, R. Aus welchen Gründen disputirte Johann Eck gegen Luther in Leipzig 1519? Zeitschrift fur die historische Theologie. XLIII, pp. 332–441. Gotha. 1873.

Baur, A. Deutschland in den Jahren 1517–1525 getrachtet im Lichte gleichzeitiger anonymer und pseudonymer deutschen Volks- und Flugschriften. Ulm. 1872.

Beard, C. Martin Luther and the Reformation in Germany until the close of the Diet of Worms. London. 1889.

Bezold, F. v. Geschichte der deutschen Reformation. Berlin. 1890.

Creighton, M. (Bishop). A History of the Papacy. Vol. VI. 2nd ed. London. 1897.

Dollinger, J. J. Die Reformation, ihre innere Entwickelung. 3 vols. Ratisbon. 1846–8.

Friedrich, J. Der Reichstag zu Worms, 1521. Nach den Briefen Aleanders. Munich. 1871.

Gebhardt, B. Die Gravamina der deutschen Nation. 2nd ed. Breslau. 1895.

Hausrath, A. Aleander und Luther auf dem Reichstage zu Worms. Berlin. 1897.

Jacoby, H. Die Liturgik der Reformatoren. Vol. I. Introduction—Liturgik Luthers. Gotha. 1871.

Janssen, J. Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters. Vol. II. 18th ed. Freiburg i. B. 1897.

Kolde, T. Luther und der Reichstag zu Worms 1521. Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte No. 1. Halle. 1883.

Kuczynski, A. Thesaurus libellorum historiam Reformatorum illustrantium (Verzeichniss einer Sammlung von nahezu 3000 Flugschriften Luther's und seiner Zeitgenossen). Leipzig. 1870.

Maurenbrecher, W. Studien und Skizzen zur Geschichte der Reformationszeit. Leipzig. 1874.

Ranke, L. v. Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation. Vols. II, III. 6th ed. Leipzig. 1881, 1882.

Seidemann, J. K. Die Leipziger Disputation im Jahre 1519. Dresden. 1843.

Schade, O. Satiren und Pasquille aus der Reformationszeit. 3 vols. Hanover. 1856–8.

Thomas, G. M. Martin Luther und die Reformationsbewegung in Deutschland 1520–1525. In Auszügen aus Marino Sanuto's Diarien. Ansbach. 1883.

Ulmann, H. Franz von Sickingen. Leipzig. 1872.

Wiedemann, T. Johann Eck. Ratisbon. 1865.

See also Bibliography of Chapters V–VIII.

CHAPTERS V—VIII.

GERMANY, 1521—1555.

I. MANUSCRIPTS.

The materials for the history of Germany during the Reformation are probably more extensive, more scattered, and more difficult of description in brief than those for the history of any other country in Europe; for whereas other States had as a rule one central government, one chancery, and one foreign office, Germany had many. There are not only the imperial archives, the domestic and foreign correspondence of Charles V and of the German *Reich*, but every important Prince had his own domestic correspondence and his correspondence with other German Princes as well as with foreign Powers; and thus there is no one repository of materials for German history as in London, Paris, or Simancas. Even the correspondence of Charles V is divided between Vienna, Brussels, and Simancas, while the despatches of foreign representatives at Charles V's Court and at the Imperial Diets must be sought principally in Rome, Paris, Venice, and London.

Next in importance to the Emperor's correspondence are the records of the Diets, of which the most complete series is that preserved at Frankfort (cf. Jung, R., *Das historische Archiv der Stadt Frankfurt am Main*, Frankfort, 1896, pp. 50, 51). These relate mainly to the internal affairs of the Empire; but the archives of the Electors and of other Princes such as the Landgrave of Hesse and the Dukes of Bavaria are important for foreign as well as for domestic history. Of these archives the chief are those of Austria at Vienna and Innsbruck, Ernestine Saxony at Weimar, Albertine Saxony at Dresden, Hesse at Marburg, Brandenburg at Berlin, the Palatinate at Heidelberg, Bavaria at Munich, Cleves at Düsseldorf, Brunswick at Wolfenbuttel, and of the spiritual electors of Mainz, Cologne, and Trier at their respective metropolitan cities.

Scarcely inferior in interest are the archives of some of the imperial cities. The 'Stadtarchiv' sometimes contains not merely bulky materials for municipal and local history, but chronicles relating the political and religious events of the day, and occasionally political correspondence of substantial value (cf. Jung *ut supra*; the mere list of classes of documents at Frankfort occupies a hundred folio pages). The political correspondence of Strassburg, for instance, is of the highest importance; while the records of smaller cities often become of prime value for events of more than local importance. Those of Muhlhausen throw much light on the history of the Peasants' War in Thuringia, those of Münster are the principal source for our knowledge of the Anabaptist rising, and those of Lübeck for the '*Grafenfehde*,' while it was on the records of Ulm that Ranke based his account of Charles V's negotiations in the winter of 1546-7. An indication of the contents of these national and local archives is given in C. A. H. Burkhardt's admirable Hand- und Adressbuch der deutschen Archive (2 pts, Leipzig, 1887).

The publication of these vast masses of material is being energetically pursued by State-governments, universities, voluntary associations, and individual scholars. There are royal and ducal historical commissions like that of Saxony and that of Baden; directions of State archives such as the Prussian; university bodies, the most active of which, the Bavarian Akademie der Wissenschaften, has published or is publishing the Allgemeine deutsche Biographie, the Jahrbücher der deutschen Geschichte, the Reichstagsakten, the Briefe und Akten zur Geschichte des XVI Jahrhunderts, the Chroniken der deutschen Stadte, the Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte and annual 'Sitzungsberichte'; voluntary associations of a theologico-historical character, such as the Gorresgesellschaft zur Pflege der Wissenschaft im katholischen Deutschland, and the Verein für Reformationsgeschichte, or with a local purpose like the Verein für Oberhessische Geschichte, or the Historische Verein für Niedersachsen. Nearly every State, and many districts and cities, have associations for the publication of their records. There are some two hundred periodical publications in Germany devoted to historical research; and practically every historical dissertation for a doctorate in German universities is based upon the study of some portion of unpublished material. The fullest guide to these current works is the annual bibliography appearing in the Historische Vierteljahrsschrift (ed. G. Seeliger, Leipzig). Elaborate surveys of the historical output for each year are contained in Berner's Jahresberichte der Geschichtswissenschaften (Berlin, XXV Bde, 1878–1902); concise ones in the Mitteilungen a. d. histor. Litteratur (edited for the Histor. Gesellsch. in Berlin by Dr F. Hirsch); while the more important articles in German periodicals are generally noticed in the Historische Zeitschrift and the English Historical Review. A slight but useful index is supplied by F. Förster's Kritischer Wegweiser durch die neuere deutsche historische Literatur, Berlin, 1900. The best general bibliography is Dahlmann-Waitz, Quellenkunde der deutschen Geschichte, 6th ed. by E. Steindorff, 1894. There are also separate bibliographies of the history of many of the chief German states.

II. PRINTED AUTHORITIES FOR THE WHOLE PERIOD 1521–1555.

A. Documents.

(i) *Relating to general history.*

Albèri, E. Le Relazioni degli Ambasciatori Veneti al Senato durante il secolo decimosesto. 15 vols. Florence. 1839–62. 3rd Ser.

Bradford, W. Correspondence of Charles V. London. 1850.

Döllinger, J. J. I. Documente zur Geschichte Karls V. In Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen und Cultur-Gesch. des XVI Jahr. Vol. 1. Ratisbon. 1862.

Fiedler, J. Relationen Venetianischer Botschafter uber Deutschland und Oesterreich im 16 Jahrh. Fontes Rerum Austriacarum. Vol. XXX. Vienna. 1870.

Förstemann, C. G. Neues Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der evangelischen Kirchenreformation. Hamburg. 1842.

Gachard, L. P. Relations des ambassadeurs vénétiens sur Charles V. Brussels. 1856.

Goldast, Melchior. Collectio Constitutionum Imperialium. Frankfort. Vols I and II. 1713.

Harpprecht, G. N. von. Staatsarchiv des kayserlichen Kammergerichts. 5 pts. Frankfort. 1757–69. Ulm. 1785–9.

Klüpfel, K. Urkunden zur Geschichte des schwabischen Bundes 1488–1533. Stuttgart. 1846–53.

Koch, C. G. Neue und vollständige Sammlung der Reichsabschiede. 4 pts. Frankfort. 1747.
Krafft, Carl. *Briefe und Dokumente aus Zeit der Reformation im 16 Jahrh.* Elberfeld. 1876.
Laemmer, H. Monumenta Vaticana. Freiburg i. B. 1861.
—— Analecta Romana. Schaffhausen. 1864.
Lanz, K. Correspondenz des Kaisers Karl V. 3 vols. Leipzig. 1844-6.
—— Aktenstücke und Briefe zur Gesch. Karls V. Mon. Habsb. Pt I. Vienna. 1854.
—— Staatspapiere zur Geschichte Karls V. Stuttgart. 1845.
Le Glay, E. Négotiations diplomatiques entre France et l'Autriche. Coll. de Documents Inédits. 2 vols. Paris. 1845.
Lenz, M Briefwechsel Philipps von Hessen mit Butzer. 3 vols. Berlin and Leipzig. 1880-91.
Letters and Papers, Foreign and Domestic, of the Reign of Henry VIII. Vols. III and IV, ed J. S. Brewer. Vols. V-XIX, ed. J. Gairdner. 1519-44. London. 1860-1903.
Löscher, V. E. Vollstandige Reformations-acta und Documenta. 3 vols. Leipzig. 1720-8.
Lünig, J. C. Das deutsche Reichsarchiv. 24 vols. Leipzig. 1713-22.
Monumenta Habsburgica. 1473-1576. 2 vols. Kaiserl. Akad. der Wissensch. Vienna. 1853-7.
Neudecker, Chr. G. Merkwurdige Aktenstucke aus dem Zeitalter der Reformation. 2 Abth. Nürnberg. 1838.
—— Urkunden aus der Reformationszeit Cassel. 1836.
Raumer, F. L. G. von. Briefe aus Paris zur Erläuterung der Gesch. des 16 und 17 Jahrh. 2 Parts. Leipzig. 1831.
Reichstagsakten unter Karl V herausgegeben durch die Münchener historische Kommission. Vol. I, ed. A. Kluckhohn. 1893. Vols. II-III, ed. A. Wrede. Gotha. 1896, 1901.
Scheurl, Chr. Briefbuch, 1505-40. Edd. E. von Soden and Knaake. Potsdam. 2 vols 1867-72.
Spanish State Papers, Calendar of. Ed. Bergenroth. Vols. I-II. Ed. Gayangos. Vols. III-VII. London. 1862-1899.
State Papers published by the Record Commission. 11 vols. London. 1830-1852.
Turba, G. Venetianische Depeschen vom Kaiserhofe. Dispacci di Germania. Vols. I-II. *Hist. Komm. d. k. Akad. d. Wissens.* Vienna. 1889, 1892.
Venetian State Papers, Calendar of. Ed. Rawdon Brown. Vols. III-VI. London. 1864-1884.

(ii) *The religious leaders and their writings.*

(a) Luther and the Lutherans.

The published volumes of the correspondence and works of Luther and his colleagues are far too numerous to be set out in detail. None of the various editions of Luther's works is completely satisfactory, the best being the Erlangen edition 1826-1879; an excellent edition by F. Knaake and others is however in course of publication (Weimar, 1883 sqq. 20 vols.). See also Burkhardt, Luthers Briefwechsel, 1866; Kolde, Analecta Lutherana, 1883; the Letters, ed. de Wette and Seidemann, 6 vols., 1825-58; Forstemann and Bindseil's editions of the Table-talk (Tischreden, 4 vols., 1844-8, and in Latin, 3 vols, 1863). The great 'Corpus Reformatorum' (ed. C. G. Bretschneider and H E. Bindseil, Halle, 1834-1900, 89 vols.) consists chiefly of the works of Melanchthon and Calvin. See also Bugenhagen's Briefwechsel, ed. Vogt, Stettin, 1888; A. L. Herminjard's Correspondances des Reformateurs dans les Pays de la langue française (10 vols., Geneva,

1886, etc.); and the works of Justus Jonas (ed. Kawerau, Halle, 1884–5), Sebastian Lotzer (ed. A. Goetze, Leipzig, 1902), Friedrich Myconius, John and Stephen Agricola, Ambrose Blaurer, John Brenz, Wolfgang Capito, Carldstadt, A. Corvinus, Andreas Osiander, J. Honterus (Vienna, 1898), Urbanus Rhegius, and Schnepf. (Cf. Hagenbach's Leben und ausgewählte Schriften der Väter der reformirten Kirche, 10 pts, Elberfeld, 1857–62.)

(*See also Bibliography of Chap. IV.*)

(b) The Humanists.

The writings of Erasmus continue to be of value until his death in 1536; there is no satisfactory edition of his works, that of Le Clerc (Leyden, 10 vols., 1703–6) being the one generally used (cf. bibliogr. note in Emerton's Erasmus, 1899, pp. xxiii–vi). See also Beatus Rhenanus, Briefwechsel, ed. Horawitz and Hartfelder (Leipzig, 1886; cf. A. Horawitz, Des Beatus Rhenanus literarische Thatigkeit 1530–47, Leipzig, 1873; and id., Die Bibliothek und Correspondenz des Beatus Rhenanus, Vienna, 1874); Ulrich Zasius, Epistolae, ed. Riegger, Ulm, 1774 (cf. R. Stintzing, Ulrich Zasius, Basel, 1857). For other Humanists consult: Fr. Roth, Willibald Pirkheimer, Halle, 1887; C. Krause, Helius Eobanus Hessus, 2 vols., Gotha, 1879; and Burkhardt-Biedermann, T., Bonifacius Amerbach und die Reformation, Basel, 1894; J. von Aschbach, Die Wiener Universitat und ihre Humanisten, Vienna, 1877; K. Hartfelder and F. von Bezold on Konrad Celtes, Historische Zeitschrift for 1882 and 1883; A. Horawitz, Caspar Bruschius, Leipzig, 1875.

(c) The Catholics.

Of the works by Catholic writers of the time the most important are those of Cochlaeus, Thomas Murner, Johann Eck, Emser, Karl von Miltitz, Alexander Hegius, J. A. Faber, Gropper, Pflug, and Johann Dietenberger (cf. W. Friedensburg, Beiträge zur Briefwechsel der katholischen gelehrten Deutschlands im Reformationszeitalter, in Zeitschr. fur Kirchengeschichte 1897–1902).

(d) The Zwinglians.

Zwingli's works are noticed in the bibliography to Chap. X. The works of his successor Heinrich Bullinger, and of Oecolampadius, Caspar Hedio, Theodore Bibliander, Leo Jud, Oswald Myconius, Joachim von Watt (Vadianus), should also be consulted.

B. Contemporary Chronicles, Histories, and Memoirs.

Bullinger, Heinrich. Reformationsgeschichte. Edd. Hottinger and Vögeli. Frauenfeld. 6 vols. 1838–40.

Charles V. Commentaries. Ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove. Brussels. 1862. (Cf. O. Waltz, Die Denkwürdigkeiten Kaiser Karls V. Bonn. 1901.)

Cochlaeus [verè Dobneck], Johann. Comment. de scriptis et actis Lutheri. 1517–1546. Mainz. 1549. Republ. as 'Historia.' Paris. 1565.

Cruciger, Caspar. Tabulae chronologicae actorum M. Lutheri. Wittenberg. 1553.

Fabricius, Henricus. Kurtze Chronick 1500–1568. Ed. L. Surius. Cologne. 1568.

Flugschriften aus der Reformationszeit. 19 parts. Halle. 1895–1902.

Franck, Sebastian. Chronica. 3 parts. Strassburg. 1531. (Later editions with additions, 1536, 1555, 1585; cf. C. A. Hase, Sebastian Franck, der Schwarmgeist,

Leipzig, 1869; H. Bischof, Seb. Franck und deutsche Geschichtschreibung, 1857; and H. Oncken, Sebastian Franck als Historiker in Hist. Zeitschr. LXXXII 385-435)
Freher, Marquard. Germanicarum rerum scriptores. 3 vols. Frankfort. 1600-11.
Herberstein, Siegmund von. Selbstbiographie 1486-1553 (Fontes Rerum Austr. I, 67-396).
Kessler, Johann. Sabbata. Ed Goetsinger. St Gall. 1870. Also edited by Egli and Schoch. St Gall. 1902
Konigstein, W. Tagebuch, 1520-48. Ed. G. E Steitz. Frankfort. 1876.
Lauterbach, A. Tagebuch. Ed. Seidemann. Dresden. 1872.
Leib, Killian. Annales, 1502-23. Ed. Aretin, Beyträge VII, IX (Munich, 1803-6), and 1524-48 in Dollinger, Beitrage II (Ratisbon, 1863).
Mathesius, J. Ausgewahlte Werke. Ed. G. Loesche. Prague. 1896-8.
Melanchthon, Philip. Historia de vita et actis Lutheri Wittenberg. 1546.
Mencke, J. B. Scriptores rerum Germanicarum praecipue Saxonicarum. Leipzig. 3 vols. 1728-30.
Myconius, Friedrich. Historia Reformationis. 1517-42. Ed. E. S. Cyprian. Leipzig 1718.
Prinsen, J. Collectanea van Gerardus Geldenhauer Noviomagus. Amsterdam. 1901
Ratzeberger, M. Handschriftliche Geschichte uber Luther und seine Zeit. Ed. Neudecker. Jena 1850
Scultetus, Abr. Annales (to 1536). In von der Hardt's Historia Literaria Frankfort. 1717.
Seckendorf, Veit Ludwig Comment. Hist. de Lutheranismo. Frankfort 1692.
Senckenberg, H C Sammlung von ungedruckt und raren Schriften zu Erläuterung der Rechte und Geschichte von Teutschland. 4 parts. Frankfort. 1745-51.
Sleidan [verè Philippson], Johann Comment. de statu religionis Carlo V Caesare Strassburg 1555. (Cf. F. W. Weise, Uber die Quellen der Comment. Sleidans, Halle, 1879; Baumgarten, Ueber Sleidans Leben und Briefwechsel, Strassburg, 1878, and Sleidans Briefwechsel, Strassburg, 1881; Th. Paur, Sleidans Kommentare uber die Regierungszeit Karls V, Leipzig, 1843; and Winckelmann, Sleidan und seine Kommentare (Zeitschr. fur Gesch. des Oberrheins, N. F. XIV, 565—606.)
Spalatin [verè Burckard, Georg]. Annales Reformationis (to 1543). Leipzig. 1768
—— Chronikon, 1513-1526. In Mencke, vol. II.
—— Hist Nachlass und Briefe. Ed. C. G. Neudecker. Jena. 1851. (Cf. Drews, 'Spalatiniana' in Zeitschr. fur Kirchen-Gesch. XIX-XX, and O. Clemen, Spalatiniana in Beitrage II, 138-42.)
Struve, B. G. Corpus Historiae Germanicae. 2 vols. Jena. 1730.
—— Rerum Germanicarum Scriptores. 3 vols. Strassburg. 1717.
Surius, Laur *Comment brevis rerum gestarum 1500-1574. Cologne. 1568.* [In answer to Sleidan]
Waltz, O. Flersheimer Chronik. Leipzig. 1874.

C. Secondary Authorities.

(i) *General histories and biographies of Charles V.*

Armstrong, E. The Emperor Charles V. 2 vols. London. 1902.
Baumgarten, H. Geschichte Karls V (to 1539). 3 vols. 1885-92.
Bezold, F. von. Geschichte der deutschen Reformation. Berlin. 1890.

Datt, Johann Philipp. Volumen rerum Germanicarum novum, sive de pace imperii publica (a history of the Swabian League). Ulm. 1698.
Egelhaaf, G. Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation. 2nd ed. Berlin. 1885.
—— Deutsche Gesch. im XVI Jahrh. bis zum 1555. Bibliothek Deutscher Gesch. Stuttgart. 2 Bde. 1889-92.
Fischer, K. Gesch. der auswärtigen Politik und Diplomatie im Reformationszeitalter. Gotha. 1874.
Häusser, L. Gesch. des Zeitalters der Reformation. Ed. Oncken. 1868. Engl. tr. 1885.
Janssen, J. Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters. Vols. III–VI. Ed. L. Pastor. Freiburg i. B. 1897. (Cf. Erläuterungen und Ergänzungen zu Janssen's Geschichte, ed. L. Pastor, Freiburg i. B., 1898 etc. and Janssen's An meine Kritiker, Freiburg, 1883.) English translation by M. A. Mitchell and A. M. Christie. 6 vols. London. 1896–1903.
Krebs, K. Beiträge und Urkunden zur deutschen Geschichte im Zeitalter der Ref. Leipzig. 1895.
Lamprecht, K. Deutsche Geschichte. Vol. v. Berlin. 1894–5. (Cf. the criticisms of H. Oncken, H. Delbrück, and M. Lenz, and Lamprecht's reply in Zwei Streitschriften, Berlin, 1897.)
Menzel, C. A. Neuere Geschichte der Deutschen. Breslau. 12 vols. 1826–48.
Namèche, A. J. L'Empereur Charles V. 5 tom. Louvain. 1889.
Nitzsch, K. W. Geschichte des deutschen Volkes bis zum Augsburger Religionsfrieden. 3 vols. 2nd ed. Leipzig. 1883–5, 1892.
Pichot, A. Charles Quint, Chronique de sa vie. Paris. 1854.
Ranke, Leopold von. Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation. 6 vols. 6th ed. Leipzig. 1882. Vols. I–III. of Sammtliche Werke. Leipzig. 1874, etc.
Robertson, William. History of the Reign of the Emperor Charles V. London 3 vols. 1770. 10th ed. 1802. Latest ed. London. 1887.
Vandenesse, J. Journal des voyages de Charles Quint. Ed. Gachard. Brussels. 1874.
Zeller, J. Hist. d'Allemagne. Vol. v. Paris. 1891.

The Allgemeine deutsche Biographie (46 Bde, Leipzig, 1875–1902) and Herzog's Realencyklopädie für Protestantische Theologie und Kirche (2nd ed. 18 Bde, Leipzig, 1877, etc.) are both indispensable works of reference, the articles being usually careful monographs written by specialists and enriched by useful bibliographical notes. Compare also numerous contributions by Baumgarten, J. Roth, Kawerau, Kolde, and other scholars to the 'Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte' (1883–1903).

(ii) *Works on Religious History.*

Alzog, G. Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte. 10th ed., by F. X. Kraus. Vol. II. Mainz. 1882.
Baum, J. W. Capito und Butzer. Vater der Reformirten Kirche. Elberfeld. 1860.
Baumgarten, H. Jakob Sturm. Strassburg. 1876.
Bayer, G. Johannes Brenz. Stuttgart. 1899.
Bubucke, H. Wilhelm Gnaphæus, ein Lehrer aus dem Reformationszeitalter Emden. 1875.
Bugenhagen, Joannes. Lives of, by L. W. Graepp (Gütersloh, 1897), H. Hering (Halle, 1888), C. A. T. Vogt (Elberfeld, 1867).
Carrière, M. Die philosophische Weltanschauung der Reformationszeit in ihren Beziehungen zur Gegenwart. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1887.

Döllinger, J. J. I. Beiträge zur politischen, kirchlichen, und Cultur-Geschichte. 2 vols. Ratisbon. 1862–3.

—— Die Reformation. 3 vols. Ratisbon. 1846–8.

Erichson, A. Martin Butzer. Strassburg. 1891.

Fabricius, J. A. Centifolium Lutheranum. Hamburg. 1728–30.

Fuessli, J. C. Carlstadts Lebensgeschichte. Frankfort. 1776.

Gerdes, D. Scrinium Antiquarium...ad hist. Ref. eccl spectant 8 vols. Groningen. 1749–65.

Gulick, W. von. Johann Gropper und seine Thatigkeit in Koln bis 1540. Munster. 1902.

Hase, C A. Kirchengeschichte. Leipzig. 11th ed. 1886.

Hartmann, Julius. Leben und ausgewahlte Schriften der Väter der lutheranischen Kirche. 5 parts. Elberfeld. 1861–70

—— E. Schnepff, der Reformator in Schwaben etc. Tübingen. 1870.

—— and Jaeger, C. Johann Brenz 2 vols. Hamburg. 1840–2.

Haussleiter, J. Melanchthon-Kompendium. Greifswald. 1902.

Heppe, H. L. J. Dogmatik des deutschen Protestantismus im 16 Jahrh. 3 vols. Gotha. 1857.

—— Geschichte der lutherischen Concordienformel und Concordie. 2 vols. Marburg. 1857–9

Jacoby, H. Die Liturgik der Reformatoren. Gotha. 1871 etc.

Jaeger, C. F. Andreas Bodenstein von Carlstadt. Stuttgart. 1856.

Jager, C. Mittheilungen zur schwabischen und frankischen Reformationsgeschichte Stuttgart 1828.

Jarcke, C. E Studien und Skizzen zur Geschichte der Reformation. Schaffhausen. 1846.

Kawerau, W Thomas Murner. Halle. 1890–1.

—— G. *Johann Agricola von Eisleben. Berlin.* 1881.

—— Hieronymus Emser. Halle. 1896.

Keil, F. S. Luthers Lebensumstande. 4 parts Leipzig. 1764.

Keim, C. T. Ambrose Blaurer, der schwabische Reformator. Stuttgart. 1860.

Keller, L. Die Reformation und die alteren Reformparteien. Leipzig. 1885.

Kolde, Th. Beitrage zur Reformationsgeschichte, in Kirchengeschichtliche Studien. 1888 etc.

—— Andreas Althamer, der Humanist und Reformator in Brandenburg-Ansbach. Erlangen. 1895.

Kurtz, J. H Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. 11th ed. Leipzig 1890.

Kugelgen, C. W. Luthers Auffassung von der Gottheit Christi. Leipzig. 1901.

—— Rechtfertigungslehre des Johs. Brenz. Leipzig. 1898.

Lemmens, Leonhard. Augustin von Alfeld. Freiburg. 1897.

Liessem, H. J. Groppers Leben und Wirken. Cologne. 1876.

Luther, Martin. Lives of, by Th. Kolde, 2 vols., 1884–93; J. Köstlin, 2 vols., Elberfeld, 1875, 5th ed. 1902; Kuhn, 3 vols, Paris, 1883; M. Lenz, 3rd ed. Berlin, 1897; Plitt and Petersen, Leipzig, 1883; H. E. Jacobs, New York, 1898; P. M. Rade, 3 vols., Tubingen, 1901.

Marheinecke, Ph. Geschichte der teutschen Reformation. 4 vols Berlin. 1831–4.

Maurenbrecher, W Geschichte der katholischen Reformation. Nordlingen. 1880.

—— Studien und Skizzen zur Geschichte der Reformationszeit. Leipzig. 1874.

Melanchthon (verè Schwarzerd), Philip. Lives of, by G. Ellinger (Berlin, 1902); J. W. Richard (New York, 1898); R. Schaefer (Gutersloh, 1897); and Schmidt (Elberfeld, 1861).

Moeller, W. Andreas Osiander. Elberfeld. 1870.

—— Reformation und Gegenreformation. Freiburg. 1899.

—— History of the Christian Church. Vol. III, trs. J. H. Freese. London. 1900.

Mosen, P. E. Hieronymus Emser. Leipzig. 1890.
Müller, Karl. Kirchengeschichte. Vol. II. Tübingen. 1902.
Neudecker, C. G. Gesch. der deutschen Reformation von 1517–1532. Leipzig. 1843.
—— Neue Beiträge zur Gesch. der Ref. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1841.
—— Gesch. des evangelischen Protestantismus in Deutschland. 2 pts. Leipzig. 1844.
Pastor, Ludwig. Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen während der Regierung Karls V. Freiburg i. B. 1879.
—— Geschichte der Päpste. 2nd ed. Freiburg. 1888, etc. Engl. transl. by Antrobus. London. 1891, etc.
Paulus, N. Die Strassburger Reformatoren und die Gewissensfreiheit. Strassburg. 1895.
—— Der Augustinermonch Johannes Hoffmeister. Freiburg. 1891.
Postina, A. Eberhard Billick. Freiburg. 1901.
Pressel, Th. Ambrosius Blaurers des Schwabischen Reformators Leben und Schriften. Stuttgart. 1861.
—— Anecdota Brentiana. Tubingen. 1868.
Schäfer, E. Luther als Kirchenhistoriker. Gutersloh. 1897.
Schäfer, W. Galerie der Reformatoren. 5 vols. Meissen. 1838–43.
Scheel, O. Luthers Stellung zur heiligen Schrift. Tübingen. 1902
Schlegel, J. K. T. Kirchen- und Reformationsgeschichte von Norddeutschland und den Hannover'schen Staaten. 3 vols. Hanover. 1828–32.
Schmidt, G. L. Justus Menius, der Reformator Thuringens. 2 vols. Gotha. 1867.
Schott, Th. Luther und die Deutsche Bibel. 2nd ed. Stuttgart. 1883.
—— Briefwechsel zwischen Christoph, Herzog von Würtemberg und P. P. Vergerius. Stuttgart, Literarischer Verein 1843, etc Vol. CXXIV.
Seidemann, J. K. Beitrage zur Reformationsgeschichte. 2 vols. Dresden. 1846–8.
—— Erlauterungen zur Reformationsgeschichte. Dresden. 1872.
—— •Karl von Miltitz. Dresden. 1844.
Seitz, O. Die Theologie d. Urbanus Rhegius, speziell sein Verhaltnis zu Luther und Zwingli. Gotha. 1898.
Soden, F. von. Beitrage zur Gesch. der Reformation und der Sitten jener Zeit Nurnberg 1855.
Spahn, M. Joh. Cochlaus. Berlin. 1897. (Cf. Th. Kolde in Realencyklop. für Prot. Theologie, IV, 194–200.)
Thomas, G. M. M. Luther und die Reformationsbewegung in Deutschland 1520–32. Ansbach. 1883.
Vogel, E. G. Bibliotheca biographica Lutherana. Halle. 1851.
Wedewer, H. G. Joannes Dietenberger. Freiburg. 1888.
Wiedemann, Th. Johann Eck. Ratisbon. 1865.

(iii) *Literature and Art.*

Erhard, H. A. Geschichte des Wiederaufblühens wissenschaftlicher Bildung. 3 vols. Magdeburg. 1827–32.
Geiger, L. Renaissance und Humanismus in Deutschland. Berlin. 1882.
Hagen, C. Deutschlands literarische und relig. Verhaltnisse im Reformationszeitalter. 3 vols. Frankfort. 1868.
Heller, J. Lucas Cranach's Leben und Werke. 2nd ed. Nürnberg. 1854.
Holstein, H. Die Reformation im Spiegelbilde der dramatischen Litteratur des 16 Jahrh. Halle. 1886.
Kawerau, W. Hans Sachs und die Reformation. Halle. 1889.

Kuczyński, A. Thesaurus libellorum historiam Reformatorum illustrantium. Leipzig. 1870.
Müller, J Luthers reformatorische Verdienste um Schule und Unterricht. Berlin. 1903.
Schade, O. Satiren und Pasquillen aus der Reformationszeit. 3 vols. Hanover. 1856–8.
Schluchardt, C. Lukas Cranachs Leben und Werke. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1851.
Schmidt, C. Histoire littéraire de l'Alsace. Paris. 2 vols. 1879.
—— La Vie et les Travaux de Jean Sturm. Strassburg. 1855.
Schweitzer, Ch. Étude sur Hans Sachs. Nancy. 1887.
Strobel, G. T. Beytrage zur Litteratur besonders des xvi Jahrh. 2 vols. Nürnberg. 1784–7
—— Neue Beyträge. 5 vols. Nurnberg. 1790–4.
Thausing, M. Durers Briefe, Tagebucher und Reime. Wien. 1872. 2nd ed. 1884.
Von der Hardt, Hermann. Historia Literaria Reformationis. Leipzig. 5 pts. 1717.
Zucker, M. Durer's Stellung zur Reformation. Erlangen. 1886.

See also works on the universities of Erfurt (by Kampschulte, 2 vols., Trier, 1856–60); Heidelberg (by J. F. Hautz, 2 vols., Mannheim, 1862–4); Marburg (by K W. Justi, Marburg, 1827); Konigsberg (by M. Toppen, Konigsberg, 1844); Jena (by J. C. E. Schwarz, Jena, 1858); Tubingen (by R. von Mohl, Tubingen, 1871, and Klüpfel, Leipzig, 1877), and Wittenberg (by F L. C. von Medem, Anclam, 1867, and G. Buchwald, Leipzig, 1893), and the Geschichte der Wissenschaften in Deutschland.

(iv) *Sociology, Economics, and Geography.*

Barthold, F W Geschichte der deutschen Stadte und des deutschen Bürgerthums 4 pts. Leipzig. 1850–3
Ehrenberg, R. Das Zeitalter der Fugger. 2 vols. Jena. 1896. (Cf. Die Stellung der Fugger zum Kirchenstreite des xvi Jahrh. in Hist. Vierteljahrsschr. 1898, 473–510.)
Erhardt, P. Die nationalökonomischen Ansichten der Reformatoren. Theol. Studien und Kritiken. Hamburg. 1880–1.
Fischer, K Deutschlands offentliche Meinung im Reformationszeitalter und in der Gegenwart. Berlin. 1895.
Heller, V Die Handelswege Inner-Deutschlands. N. Archiv für Sachs. Gesch. vol. v.
Hentzner, Paul. Itinerarium Germaniae ... Nurnberg. 1612.
Hering, H. Ueber die Liebesthatigkeit der deutschen Reformation. (To 1529.) In Theol. Studien und Kritiken. Hamburg. 1883–5.
Kaser, K Politische und soziale Bewegungen im deutschen Bürgerthum zu Beginn des 16 Jahrh Stuttgart. 1899.
Kawerau, W Die Reformation und die Ehe. Halle. 1892.
Liliencron, R. von. Deutsches Leben im Volkslied um 1530. Stuttgart. 1886.
Munster, Sebastian. Cosmographia. Basel. 1545.
Nobbe, H. Die Regelung der Armenpflege im 16 Jahrh. Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. x.
Richter, P. E. Bibliotheca geographica Germaniae. Leipzig. 1896.
Riggenbach, B Das Armenwesen der Reformation. Basel. 1883.
Schmoller, G. Zur Gesch. der national-okonomischen Ansichten in Deutschland wahrend der Reformationsperiode. Zeitschr für d. Ges. Staatswiss. Vol. xvi.
Stern, A. Die Socialisten der Reformationszeit. Berlin. 1883
Sugenheim, S. Frankreichs Einfluss auf Deutschland. 2 vols. Stuttgart. 1845–56.
Voigt, J. Fürstenleben und Furstensitte. Raumer's Hist. Taschenbuch, 1835.

Werner, J. Die soziale Frage im Zeitalter der Reformation. 1889. In Weber's Sammlung theologischer und socialer Reden und Abhandlungen. Mühlheim. 1888, etc.

See also Schmoller's Staats- und sozialwissenschaftliche Forschungen, 18 vols., Leipzig, 1878, etc.; and the Zeitschrift fur sozial- und wirthschaftliche Geschichte. Freiburg, 1893–1903.

(v) *Constitutional History.*

Beiträge zur Geschichte des romischen Rechts in Deutschland. Stuttgart. 1896 etc.
Below, G. von. Territorium und Stadt. Historische Bibliothek. 1900.
Boehmer, J. H. Meditationes in constitutionem criminalem Carolinam. Halle. 1770.
—— Jus Ecclesiasticum Protestantium. 5 vols. Halle. 1720–63.
Brunner, H. Forschungen zur Geschichte des deutschen Reichs. Stuttgart. 1894.
Eichhorn, C. F. Deutsche Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte. 4 pts. Göttingen. 1821–3.
Furstenwerth, L. Die Verfassungsanderungen in den Reichsstadten zur Zeit Karls V. Gottingen. 1893.
Gierke, Otto. Untersuchungen zur deutschen Staats- und Rechtsgeschichte. Breslau. 1878–99.
Goldast, Melchior. Monarchia S. Romani Imperii. 2 vols. Frankfort. 1611–14.
—— Politische Reichshandel. Frankfort. 1614.
Holtzendorff, F. Encyklopadie der Rechtswissenschaft. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1870–1.
Laband, P. Das Staatsrecht des deutschen Reiches. 4th ed. Tubingen. 1901.
Lunig, J. C. Thesaurus juris der Grafen und Herren des heilig. romisch. Reichs. Leipzig. 1725.
Moser, J. J. Teutsches Staatsrecht. 50 vols. 1737–54.
Muller, K. E. H. Reichssteuern und Reichsreformationsbestrebungen im xv und xvi Jahrh.
Rachel, Walther. Verwaltungsorganisation und Ämterwesen der Stadt Leipzig bis 1627. Leipzig. 1902.
Rieker, Karl. Staat und Kirch nach lutherischer, reformirter, moderner Anschauung. Hist. Vierteljahrsch. 1898, 370—416.
Schröder, R. Lehrbuch der deutschen Rechtsgeschichte. 3rd ed. Leipzig. 1898.
Stintzing, R. Gesch. der deutschen Rechtswissenschaft. Munich. 1880.
Stobbe, O. Geschichte der deutschen Rechtsquellen. 2 pts. Brunswick. 1860–4.
Turner, S. E. Sketch of the Germanic Constitution. New York. 1888

D. Separate States and their Rulers.

(i) *Secular and territorial States and Districts.*

(a) Austria and the Austrian Duchies.

Bachmann, A. Lehrbuch der Oesterreichischen Reichsgeschichte. Prague. 1896.
Böhl, E. Beitrage zur Gesch. der Reformation in Oesterreich. Jena. 1902.
Buchholtz, F. B. Gesch. der Regierung Ferdinands I. 9 vols. Vienna. 1831–8.
Fontes rerum Austriacarum. 50 vols. Vienna. 1849–1901. (An index to these 50 vols. was publ. by V. Junk, 1901.)
Gévay, A. Urkunden und Aktenstucke zur Gesch. der Verhältnisse zwischen Oesterreich, Ungarn, und der Pforte 1526–1541. Vienna. 9 pts. 1838–42.
Huber, A. Geschichte Oesterreichs. Vols. iv–v. (Gesch. d. europ. Staaten.) Gotha. 1888.
Krones, F. X. Handbuch der Oesterreich. Gesch. 5 vols. Berlin. 1876–9.
—— Grundriss der Oesterreichischen Geschichte. Vienna. 1882.

Kupelweiser, L. Die Kämpfe Oesterreichs mit d. Osmanen 1526-37. Vienna. 1899.
Loserth, J. Reformation und Gegenreformation in den innerösterreich. Ländern. Stuttgart. 1898-8.
Luschin v. Ebengreuth, A. Österreichische Reichsgeschichte. Bamberg. 1896.
Raupach, B. Evangelische Oesterreich. 6 pts. Hamburg. 1732-44.
Waldau, G. E. Gesch. der Protestanten in Oesterreich, Steyermark, Kärnthen und Krain. 2 pts 1784.
Wiedemann, Th. Gesch. der Reformation und Gegenreformation im Lande unter der Enns. Prague. 1879
Wolf, A. Gesch. Bilder aus Oesterreich. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1866.

See also the Archiv fur Kunde Oesterreichischer Geschichtsquellen, 33 vols., Vienna, 1848-65, continued as the Archiv fur Oesterreichische Geschichte, 53 vols., Vienna, 1865-1903.

(b) Baden.

Bossert, G. Beiträge zur badisch-pfälzische Reform-Gesch. Zeitschr. für Gesch. des Oberrheins. Vol. XVII. 1902.
Fester, R. Die Religionsmandate des Markgrafen Philipp von Baden 1522-33 Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. Vol. XI.
Jaeger, Carl. Briefe und Bilder aus dem Grossherzogthum Baden. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1841.
Vierordt, K. F. Gesch der evangel Kirche in Baden. 2 vols. Carlsruhe. 1847-56

See also the Zeitschrift fur Gesch. des Oberrheins published by the Badische histor. Kommission since 1886.

(c) Bavaria.

Aretin, C M. von Bayerns auswartige Verhältnisse seit dem Anfang des XVI Jahrh. Passau. 1839.
Muffat, C. A Correspond und Aktenstucke zur Gesch der polit. Verhältnisse der Herzoge Wilhelm und Ludwig von Baiern 1527-1541. Munich. 1857.
Riezler, S. Geschichte Baierns. Vol. IV. Gotha. 1899. (Gesch. d. europ. Staaten.)
Rudhart, Ignaz Geschichte der Landstande in Baiern. 2 vols. Munich. 1819.
Sugenheim, S. Bayerns Kirchen- und Volkszustande im XVI Jahrh. Giessen. 1842
Winter, V. A. Geschichte der evangelischen Lehre in Baiern. 2 pts. Munich. 1809-10.

See also the Forschungen der konigl. bayerischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Munich, 1860, etc. (Index to vols. I-XX publ. by Gustav Buchholz, Gottingen, 1880); and the Sitzungsberichte der historischen Classe of the Akademie der Wissenschaften, Munich, 1871-1903.

(d) Bohemia.

Bachmann, A. Geschichte Bohmens. Gotha. 1899.
Dačicky, M. Pamĕti. Ed. A. Rezek. 2 vols Prague. 1878-80.
Denis, E. Fin de l'indépendance Bohème. Part II. Paris. 1890.
Freher, M. Scriptores rerum Bohemicarum. 2 vols Hanover. 1602.
Gindély, A. Quellen zur Gesch. der Bohmischen Bruder. Fontes Rerum Austr. XIX. 1857-8
—— Die bohmischen Landtagsverhandlungen, von 1526 bis auf die Neuzeit. Prague. 1877 etc.
—— Monumenta Historica Bohemica. 11 pts. Prague. 1865-70.
Gluth, O. Die Wahl Ferdinands I zum Konig von Bohmen. Mittheil. d. Vereins f. d. Gesch. der Deutschen in Bohmen. Prague. 1862, etc. Vol. XV.
Landtagsverhandlungen, D. bohm., u. Landtagsbeschlüsse v. J. 1526 bis auf die Neuzeit. Herausg. vom k. bohm. Landesarchiv. Prague.

Palácky, Fr. Geschichte von Böhmen. 5 vols. Prague. 1836-67.
Rezek, A. Gesch. der Regierung Ferdinands I in Böhmen. Prague. 1878.
Rieger, G. C. Die alten und neuen Böhmische Brüder. 3 vols. Zullichau. 1734-9.

See also the publications of the Verein für Geschichte der Deutschen in Böhmen. Prague. 1862, etc.

(e) Brandenburg and Prussia.

Altmann, W. Ausgewählte Urkunden zur brandenburg-preussischen Verfassungs- und Verwaltungsgeschichte. 2 vols. Berlin. 1897.
Baczko, L. A. F. von. Geschichte Preussens. 6 vols. Königsberg. 1792-1800.
Bornhak, C. Geschichte des preussischen Verwaltungsrechts. 3 vols. Berlin. 1884-8.
Droysen, J. G. Gesch. der preussischen Politik. 5 vols. Berlin. 1855-86.
Hartknoch, A. C. Preussische Kirchenhistoria. Frankfort. 1686.
Heidemann, J. Die Reformation in der Mark Brandenburg. Berlin. 1889.
Preussischen Geschichtschreiber, Die, des xvi und xvii Jahrh. Verein für die Gesch. des Preussens. Leipzig. 1876.
Ranke, L. von. Zwolf Bücher preussischer Geschichte. 5 vols. Leipzig. 1874.
Spieker, Ch. W. Kirchen- und Reformationsgeschichte der Mark Brandenburg. Berlin. 1839.
Stölzel, A. Brandenburg-Preussens Rechtsverwaltung und Rechtsverfassung. 2 vols. Berlin. 1888.
Tschakert, P. Urkundenbuch zur Reformationsgeschichte des Herzogthums Preussen. 3 vols. Leipzig. 1890.
Voigt, J. Briefwechsel der Gelehrten mit Herzog Albrecht von Preussen. Königsberg. 1841.

See also the Zeitschrift für preussische Geschichte und Landeskunde, the Hohenzollern Forschungen and the publications of the Verein für die Geschichte des Preussens.

(f) Brunswick.

Havemann, H. Geschichte von Braunschweig-Luneburg. 3 vols. Göttingen. 1853-7.
Heinemann, O. Geschichte von Braunschweig und Hannover. Gotha. 1882.
Hüne, A. Geschichte von Hannover und Braunschweig. 2 pts. Hanover. 1824-30.
Koldewey, F. Beiträge zur Kirchen- und Schulgeschichte des Herzogtums Braunschweig. Wolfenbuttel. 1888.
Lentz, C. G. H. Braunschweigs Kirchenreformation. Leipzig. 1828.
Spittler, L. T. Geschichte von Calenberg. 2 vols. Gottingen. 1786.
Stüve, J. E. Beschreibung und Geschichte d. Hochstifts und Furstenthums Osnabrück. Osnabruck. 1789.
Vaterländisches Archiv für hannoverisch-braunschw. Geschichte. Edd. Spilcker and Brönnenberg. Lüneburg. 1830-3.
Wrede, A. Die Einführung der Reformation im luneburgischen Lande. Gottingen. 1887.
—— Ernst der Bekenner, Herzog von Braunschweig. Halle. 1888.

See also the Zeitschrift des historischen Vereins für Niedersachsen. Hanover.

(g) Cleves-Julich-Berg.

Below, G. von. Landtagsakten von Jülich-Berg. Vol. I. 1400-1562. Düsseldorf. 1895.
Koch, H. H. Die Reformation in Julich. 2 vols. Frankfort. 1883.

See also the Zeitschrift des Bergischen Geschichtsvereins. Bonn. 1863, etc.

(h) Elsass.

Rathberger, J. Elsässische Reformationsgeschichte. 2 pts. Strassbu
Rohrich, T. W. Geschichte der Reformation in Elsass. 3 pts. Strassbı

(i) Franconia.

Lith, J. W. von der. Erläuterung der frankischen Reformationshisto:
bach. 1733.
Stein, F. Geschichte Frankens. 2 vols. Schweinfurt. 1885–6.

(j) Hesse.

Ackermann, C. A. Bibliotheca Hessiaca. 10 pts. Cassel. 1884–99.
Glagau, Hans. Anna von Hessen. Marburg. 1899.
Hassencamp, F. W. Hessische Kirchengeschichte im Zeitalter der I
2 vols. Marburg. 1852–5.
Hessische Landtagsakten. Hist. Komm. fur Hesse und Waldeck. Mar
Koehler, W. Hessische Kirchenverfassung im Zeitalter der Reformatio
1894.
Lanze, Wigand. Hessische Chronik. Zeitschr. des Vereins für H
schichte. Cassel. 1837.
Muenscher, F. Geschichte von Hessen. Marburg. 1894.
Paetel, G. Die Organisation des hessischen Heeres unter Philipp
muthigen. Berlin. 1897.
Rommel, Ch. von Philipp der Grossmuthige. 3 vols. Giessen. 183
—— Geschichte von Hessen. 10 vols. Marburg and Cassel. 1820–.

See also the Mittheilungen des Oberhessischen Vereins für Geschicht
Folge xi, 1—30.

(k) Holstein.

Waitz, G. Schleswig-Holsteins Geschichte. 2 vols. Göttingen. 185

(l) Hungary.

Bel, M. Adparatus ad historiam Hungariae. 2 pts. Posen. 1735–46
—— Compendium Hungariae Geographicum. Posen. 1753.
Csuday, Eugen. Die Geschichte der Ungarn. Ed. Marvai. Berlin. 2
(Cf. Hist. Vierteljahrschrift, 1903, i, 91 sqq.)
Engel, J. C. Monumenta Ungrica. Vienna. 1809.
Fessler, I. A. Die Geschichte der Ungarn. 10 vols. Leipzig. 181
best edition, by E Klein, is not in the British Museum.]
Horváth, M. Geschichte Ungarns. 2 vols. Pesth. 1863.
Istváni, N. Regni Hungarici historiae lib. xxxiv. Vienna. 1758.
Katona, István. Hist. critica primorum Hungariae Ducum. Hist. R
Austriacae. 22 vols. Buda. 1778–1810.
Pray, G. S. J. Epistolae Procerum regni Hungariae (to 1531). Vienn
Smolka, S. Ferdinands I Bemühungen um die Krone von Unga
für Oesterr. Gesch. Vienna. 1848. Vol. vii.
Verancsics, A. De rebus gestis Joannis [Zapolya] Regis Hungaria
Kovachich's Scriptores Rerum Hung., Buda, 1798, vol. 2, pp. 39 e

See also the Monumenta Hungariae Historica in course of public
Magyar Tudomanyos Akadémia. Pesth. 1857, etc.

(m) Mecklenburg.

Beltz, R. Mecklenburgische Geschichte in Einzeldarstellungen. Berlir
Rudloff, F. A. Mecklenburgische Geschichte. 3 pts. Schwerin. 17

Schnell, H. Mecklenburg im Zeitalter der Reformation. Berlin. 1900.

Schreiber, H. Johann Albrecht I, Herzog von Mecklenburg. Schrift. des Vereins für Ref. Gesch. 1899.

Schröder, D. Kirchenhistorie des evangelischen Mecklenburgs. 2 pts. Rostock. 1788.

Stein, F. Herzog Magnus von Mecklenburg, Bischof von Schwerin. Schwerin. 1899.

Von Lützow, C. E. Geschichte Mecklenburgs. 3 pts. Berlin. 1827–35.

(n) Oldenburg.

See Jahrbuch für Geschichte des Herzogthums Oldenburg. 7 vols.

(o) The Palatinate.

Alting, H. Historia Ecclesiae Palatinae. In Monumenta Pietatis. Pt I. Frankfort. 1701.

Gothein, E. Die Landstande der Kurpfalz. Zeitschr. für Gesch. des Oberrheins. N. F. Vol. III.

Häusser, L. Gesch. der rheinischen Pfalz. 2 vols. Heidelberg. 1845.

Jung, H. In Beitrage Bayer. Kirchengeschichte. Vol. I. [Catalogue of materials for the eccles. history of the Palatinate]

Leodius, Hubertus Thomas. Annal. de vita Frederici El. Palatini lib. XIV. Frankfort. 1624. (Cf. Hasenclever, Die Schmalkaldener, 1901, pp. 242–7.)

Lippert, F. Reformation in Kirche, Sitte, und Schule der Oberpfalz. Freiburg. 1897.

Remling, F. X. Das Reformationswerk in der Pfalz. Mannheim. 1846.

See also the Zeitschrift fur Geschichte des Oberrheins, and Gesellschaft für rheinische Geschichtskunde.

(p) Pomerania.

Barthold, F. W. Geschichte von Rügen und Pommern. 4 pts. Hamburg. 1839–45.

Berckmann, Joannes. Stralsundische Chronik. In Mohnike and Zober's Stralsundische Chroniken. Pt I. Stralsund. 1883.

Kantzow, Th. Chronik von Pommern: ed. Bohmer, Stettin 1835 and again in 1896–7.

Medem, F. L. B. von. Geschichte der Einführung der evangel. Lehre in Pommern. Greifswald. 1837.

Ripke, J. N. Die Einführung der Reformation in den baltischen Provinzen. Riga. 1883.

(q) Saxony.

Becker, J. Kurfürst Johann und seine Beziehungen zu Luther 1520–8. Leipzig. 1890.

Bottiger, C. W. Gesch. des Kurstaates und Königr. Sachsen. 2nd ed. Heeren and Ukert's series. Hamburg. 1867.

Buchholtz, G. Bibliothek der sachs. Geschichte. Leipzig. 1902, etc.

Burckhardt, C. A. Ernestinische Landtagsakten 1487–1532. Thüringische Geschichtsquellen. N. F. Vol. V. Jena. 1902.

Glafey, A. F. Geschichte des Chur- und Fürstlichen Hauses zu Sachsen. 4th ed. Nurnberg. 1753.

Seidemann, J. K. Die Reformationszeit in Sachsen 1517–1539. Dresden. 1846.

Wachsmuth, E. W. G. Niedersächsische Geschichte. Berlin. 1863.

Welck, H. Georg der Bartige, Herzog von Sachsen. Brunswick. 1900.

See also the Archiv and Neues Archiv für Sachsische Geschichte; the Geschichtsquellen der Provinz Sachsen, Magdeburg, 28 vols.; the Geschichtsquellen der

Provinz Sachsen und angrenzenden Gebiete, xxx vols., Halle; and the Publications of the Sächsische Kommission für Geschichte, which has in preparation the Akten und Briefe des Herzogs Georg, the Pol. Corresp. of Maurice, a bibliography of Saxon history by Hautzsch, and Akten zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges.

(r) Silesia.

Biermann, G. Geschichte des Protestantismus in Oesterreichisch-Schlesien. Prague 1897.

Soffner, J. Gesch. der Reformation in Schlesien. Breslau. 1887.

Wachter, F. Schlesien unter Ferdinand 1524–64. Zeitschr. des Vereins für Gesch. Schlesiens. Vol. xix. Breslau. 1856, etc.

(s) Swabia.

Baumann, F. L. Forschungen zur schwabischen Geschichte. Kempten. 1898.

Keim, C. Schwabische Reformationsgeschichte. Tubingen. 1855.

Pfister, J. C. Geschichte von Schwaben. 5 vols. Stuttgart. 1803–1827.

See also the Zeitschrift des historischen Vereins fur Schwaben und Neuburg.

(t) Württemberg.

Ernst, V. Briefwechsel des Herzogs Christoph. 2 vols. Stuttgart. 1899–1901.

Hartmann, J. Wurttembergische Kirchengeschichte. Stuttgart. 1893.

—— Geschichte der Reformation in Wurttemberg. Stuttgart. 1835.

Heyd, L. F. Ulrich, Herzog zu Wurttemberg. 3 vols. Tubingen. 1841–4.

Heyd, W. Bibliographie der wurttembergischen Geschichte. 2 vols. Stuttgart. 1897.

Kugler, B. Herzog Ulrich von Wurttemberg. Stuttgart. 1865.

—— Christoph, Herzog zu Wurttemberg. 2 vols. Stuttgart. 1868–72.

Pfister, J. C. Herzog Christoph zu Würtemberg. 2 pts. Tübingen. 1819–20.

Sattler, C F. Gesch. des Herzogthums Württemberg. 5 pts. Ulm. 1764–8.

Schäfer, D Wurttembergische Geschichtsquellen. Stuttgart. Vols. 1–11. 1894–5.

Schmid, J. C. and Pfister, J. C. Denkwurdigkeiten der Wurtemberg. und Schwabischen Reformationsgeschichte 2 vols. Tubingen. 1817.

Schneider, E. Wurttembergische Geschichte. Stuttgart. 1896.

—— Wurttembergische Reformationsgeschichte. Stuttgart. 1887.

Stälin, P. F. von. Gesch. Wirtembergs. Vol. iv. Stuttgart. 1873.

See also the Wurttembergische Vierteljahrshefte fur Landesgeschichte and the Zeitschrift of the Verein fur das Wurttembergische Franken.

(u) *Ecclesiastical States.*

Augsburg. Braun, P. L. Geschichte der Bischofe von Augsburg. 4 vols. Augsburg. 1813–15.

Steichele, A. Das Bisthum Augsburg Augsburg 1861, etc.

Bamberg. Erhard, O. Die Reformation in Bamberg 1522–1556. Erlangen. 1898.

Heller, Joseph. Reformationsgeschichte des ehemaligen Bisthums Bamberg. Bamberg. 1825.

Looshorn, J. Die Geschichte des Bisthums Bamberg. Munich. 1886, etc. Vol. iv.

Cologne. Ennen, L. Gesch. der Ref. im Bereiche der alten Erzdiócese Koln. Cologne. 1849.

Ley, C. A. Die Kolnische Kirchengeschichte. Cologne. 1882.

Meyer, C. Koln im Zeitalter der Reformation. 1892. (Sammlung wiss. Vortrage, N. F. Ser. vii, No. 153.)

Halberstadt. Langenbeck, W. Gesch. der Ref. des Stiftes. Gottingen. 1886.

Mainz. Gudenus, V. F. Codex diplomaticus Moguntinus. Göttingen. 1743-68.
Hennes, J. Albrecht von Brandenburg, Erzbischof von Mainz. Mainz. 1858.
May, J. Der Kurfürst, Kardinal, und Erzbischof Albrecht II. 2 vols. Munich. 1865-75.
Redlich, P. Kardinal Albrecht von Brandenburg. Mainz. 1900.
Münster. Erhard, H. A. Geschichte Münsters. Münster. 1837.
Salzburg. Schmid, J. Anfang der Reformation im Erzstift Salzburg 1517-25. Salzburg. 1899.

See also the Mittheilungen der Gesellschaft für Salzburg. Landeskunde. 40 vols.

Speier. Remling, F. X. Geschichte der Bischofe von Speier. 2 vols. Mainz. 1852-4.
—— Urkundenbuch zur Geschichte der Bischofe von Speier. 2 vols. Mainz. 1852-3.
Trier. Die Reformation in Trier. Bonn. 1845.
Wurzburg. Ludewig, J. P. Wurzburgische Geschichtsschreiber. Frankfort. 1713.
Braun, C. Gesch. der Heranbildung des Klerus in der Diocese Wurzburg. 2 vols. Wurzburg. 1889-97.

(iii) *The Cities.*

The most important source for the history of German cities is the great series of Chroniken der deutschen Stadte, ed. Karl Hegel, xxix vols., Leipzig, 1862-1902, which is still in progress. It comprises at present the Nurnberg 'Chroniken' (5 vols.), Augsburg (5 vols.), Brunswick (2 vols.), Magdeburg (2 vols.), Strassburg (2 vols), Cologne (3 vols.), Regensburg (1 vol.), Mainz (2 vols.), Lübeck (3 vols.), and the Westphalian and Lower Rhine cities (3 vols.). Besides this series most large German towns have published or are publishing their 'Urkundenbucher,' but this class of document refers generally to a period earlier than the Reformation. The more important towns have also as a rule their 'Gesellschaft,' 'Archiv' or 'Verein für Geschichte,' and it would require a whole volume to enumerate the various political and constitutional histories of German towns. The following list comprises only histories of the Reformation in some of the more important towns which materially influenced the general course of German history.

Augsburg. Jaeger, C. Gesch. der Stadt Augsburg. Darmstadt. 1837.
Roth, Fr. Augsburgs Reformationsgeschichte 1517-30. Munich. 1881. Re-ed. Augsburg. 1901.
Von Stetten, Paul. Geschichte der Reichsstadt Augsburg. Augsburg. 1762, 1788.
Wolfart, K. Die Augsburger Reformation in 1533-4. Leipzig. 1901.
Colmar. Rocholl, H. Anfange der Reformation in Colmar. Leipzig. 1875-8.
—— Die Einführung der Reformation in Colmar. Leipzig. 1876.
Constance. Issel, E. Reformation in Konstanz. Freiburg. 1898.
Laible, J. Geschichte der Stadt Konstanz. Constance. 1896.
Esslingen. Keim, C. T. Reformationsblätter der Reichstadt Esslingen. Esslingen. 1860.
Frankfort. Jung, R. Frankfurter Chroniken und annalistische Aufzeichnungen der Reformationszeit. Frankfort. 1888.
Steitz, G. E. Der lutherische Pradikant H. Beyer. Ein Zeitbild aus Frankfurts Kirchengeschichte. Frankfort. 1852.
Goslar. Hölscher, H. Gesch. der Reformation in Goslar. Hannover. 1902.
Göttingen. Erdemann, G. Gesch. der Reformation. Gottingen. 1888.
Greifswald. Uckeley, A. Reform-Gesch. der Stadt Greifswald. Greifswald. 1902.

Hamburg. Goos, M. Hamburgs Politik um die Mitte des XVI Jahrh. Hamburg. 1896.

Sillem, H. C. W. Die Einführung der Reformation in Hamburg. Verein für Ref Gesch. Halle. 1886.

Hanover. Bahrdt, W. Gesch. der Ref. Hanover. 1891.

Leipzig. Buchwald, G. Reformationsgeschichte der Stadt Leipzig. Leipzig. 1900.

Seifert, F. Die Reformation in Leipzig. Leipzig. 1883.

Lübeck. Schreiber, H. Die Reformation Lübecks. Halle. 1902.

Luneburg. Wrede, A. Die Einfuhrung der Reformation in Lüneburg. Göttingen. 1887.

Magdeburg. Huelsse, F. Die Einfuhrung der Ref. in der Stadt Magdeburg. Magdeburg. 1883.

Marburg. Kolbe, W. Die Einfuhrung der Reformation in Marburg. Marburg. 1871

Memmingen Dobel, F. Memmingen im Reformationszeitalter. 5 pts. Memmingen. 1877–8.

Unold, J. F Reformationsgeschichte der Stadt Memmingen. Memmingen. 1817.

Nordlingen Geyer, C. Die Nordlinger evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des XVI Jahrhunderts. Munich. 1896.

Nurnberg. Baader, J. Beitrage zur Kunstgesch. Nürnbergs. Nördlingen. 1860.

Heide, G. Beitrage zur Gesch. Nurnbergs in der Reformationszeit. Maurenbrecher's Taschenbuch, 1892

Ludewig, S. Die Politik Nurnbergs im Zeitalter der Reformation. Gottingen. 1893.

Roth, F. Die Einführung der Reformation in Nurnberg. Würzburg. 1885.

On J. Mullner's MS Annales of Nurnberg *see* Lochner in Hist. Pol. Blatter LXXIV 841–865, 901–924.

Ratisbon. Gemeiner, Carl T. Regensburgische Chronik. 4 vols. Ratisbon. 1800–24

Geyer, W. Die Einführung der Reformation in Regensburg. Ratisbon. 1892.

Reutlingen. Hartmann, Julius Matthaus Alber, der Reformator der Reichsstadt Reutlingen. Tubingen. 1863

Strassburg. Baum, A. Magistrat und Reformation in Strassburg bis 1529. Strassburg. 1887.

Birck, H Die politische Correspondenz der Stadt Strassburg im Zeitalter d. Reformation. Strassburg. 1882 etc.

Gerbert, C Gesch. der Strassb. Sektenbewegung 1524–34. Strassburg. 1889.

Hubert, F. Die Strassburg. Liturg.-Ordnungen im Zeitalter der Ref. Gottingen. 1900.

Renouard de Bussière, M. T. Hist. de l'Établissement du Protestantisme à Strasbourg Paris. 1856

—— Hist. du Développement du Protestantisme à Strasbourg. 2 vols. Strassburg. 1859.

Virck, H and Winckelmann, O. Politische Korresp. der Stadt Strassburg im Zeitalter der Ref. Vol. I. Strassburg. 1879. Vol. II. 1887. Vol. III. 1898

Ulm. Keim, C. T. Die Reformation der Reichsstadt Ulm. Stuttgart. 1851.

Worms. Soldau, Hans Beitrage zur Gesch. der Stadt Worms. Worms. 1896.

III. MONOGRAPHS, ETC. REFERRING TO SEPARATE CHAPTERS.

A. Chapter V. National Opposition to Rome.

Baader, Joseph. Die Fehde des Thomas von Absberg wider den Schwäbischen Bund. Munich. 1880.

Balan, P. Monumenta Reformationis Lutheranae ex tabulis S. Sedis secretis 1521–5. Ratisbon. 1883–4.

Barge, H. Neue Aktenstücke zur Gesch. d. Wittenberger Unruhen von 1521–2. Zeitschr. für Kirch.-Gesch. xxii. 120–9.

Barthold, F. W. Georg von Frundsberg. Hamburg. 1833.

Baur, A. Deutschland in den Jahren 1517–27. Ulm. 1872.

Bogler, W. Hartmuth von Kronberg. Zeitschr. für Reform-Gesch. no. 57, 1897.

Brasse, Ernst. Die Gesch. des Speierer Nationalkonzils vom Jahre 1524. Halle. 1890

Bremer, F. P. Franz von Sickingen's Fehde gegen Trier. Strassburg. 1885.

Brieger, Th. Aleander und Luther. Gotha. 1884

Brückner, A. Zur Gesch. des Reichstags von Worms. Die Verhandlungen über das Regiment. Heidelberg. 1860

Clemen, O. Beiträge zur Reformationsgeschichte. Aus Büchern und Handschriften der Zwickauer Ratsschulbibliotek. 2 vols. Berlin. 1901–2.

Druffel, A. von. Die Bayrische Politik im Beginne der Reformationszeit 1519–24. Munich. 1885.

Friedensburg, W. Eine ungedruckte Depesche Aleanders (Quellen aus Italienischen Archiv. Vol i, 1897).

—— Der Regensburger Konvent von 1524 In Hist. Aufsätze dem Andenken an G. Waitz gewidmet. Hanover. 1886.

Friedrich, J. Der Reichstag in Worms, 1521. Munich. 1870.

Gachard, P Corresp de Charles V und Adrien VI. Brussels. 1859.

Gebhardt, B. Die hundert Gravamina der Deutschen Nation. Breslau. 1884 2nd ed. 1895.

Haupt, H. Beitrage zur Reformationsgeschichte der Reichsstadt Worms, 1523–4. Giessen. 1898.

Hausrath, A. Aleander und Luther. Berlin. 1898.

Hofler, C. A. C. von. Papst Adrian VI. Vienna. 1880.

Hutten, Ulrich von. Schriften. Ed. C. Bocking. Leipzig. 1859–69. Cf. Strauss, D F. Ulrich von Hutten. 2 pts. Leipzig. 1858. 4th ed. 1878.

Jorg, J. E. Deutschland in der Revolutionsepoche 1522–6. Freiburg. 1851.

Kalkoff, Paul. Die Depeschen des Nuntius Aleander vom Wormser Reichstag. 2nd ed. Halle. 1897.

—— Briefe, Depeschen, und Berichte uber Luther. Halle. 1898

Kawerau, G. Luthers Ruckkehr von der Wartburg nach Wittenberg. Halle 1901

—— Thomas Murner und die deutsche Reformation. Halle. 1891.

Keller, Ludwig. Aus den Anfangsjahren der Reformation. Monatshefte d. Comenius-Gesellschaft, Berlin, 1899, pp 176–85.

Kolde, Th. Friedrich der Weise und die Anfange der Reformation. Erlangen. 1881.

Kraus, V. Das Nürnberger Reichsregiment. Innsbruck. 1883.

Meyer, Chr. Der Wiedertaufer Nikolas Storch. Hohenzollerische Forschungen Berlin. v, 273–81.

Moser, J. J. Beiträge zur reichsritterschaftlichen Sachen. Nurnberg. 1773–4.

Münch, E. Franz von Sickingens Thaten, Plane, Freunde und Ausgang. 3 pts. Stuttgart. 1827–9.

Pirckheimer, Charitas. Denkwürdigkeiten. Ed. C. A. C. von Höfler. Bamberg. 1852.
Rathgeber, J. Thomas Murner's Nova Germania. Sybel's Hist. Zeitschr. 1877, 3.
Redlich, O. Der Reichstag von Nurnberg 1522-3. Leipzig. 1887.
Rettberg, P. Studien zum Verstandnis der Politik des Kurfürst. Richard von Tner 1519-26. Greifswald. 1901.
Richter, E. A. Der Reichstag zu Nürnberg 1524. Leipzig. 1888.
Soldan, F. Der Reichstag zu Worms 1521. Worms. 1883.
Thomas, G. M. Luther und die Reformationsbewegung in Deutschland 1520-5. Ansbach. 1883
Tschakert, Paul Georg von Polentz, Bischof von Samland. Leipzig. Kirchengesch Studien. 1888
Uhlhorn, J. G. W. Die Reformation. Part II. Luther und die Schwärmeu. Hanover. 1868.
Ulmann, H. Franz von Sickingen. Leipzig 1872.
Waltz, O. Der Wormser Reichstag im Jahre 1521. Forschungen z. Deutschen Gesch. Vol. VIII. Gottingen.
Weizsacker, J. Der Versuch eines Nationalkonzils in Speier den 11 Nov. 1524. Sybel's Hist. Zeitschr. LXIV.
Wille, J. Die Uebergabe des Herzogthums Wurtemberg an Karl V. Forschungen zur D. Gesch. Vol. XXI.
Wulcker, E and Virck, H. Des kursachs. Rathes Hans von Planitz Berichte aus dem Reichsregiment in Nurnberg 1521-3. Konigl. Sachs. Komm. Leipzig. 1899.
—— Reichstag und Reichsregiment zu Anfang der Reformationszeit. Preuss. Hist. Jahrb. 1884.
Wyneken, C. F. Die Regimentsordnung von 1521 in ihrem Zusammenhange mit dem Churverein. Forschungen zur D Gesch. Vol. VIII.

B. CHAPTER VI. SOCIAL REVOLUTION AND CATHOLIC REACTION.

(i) *The Peasants' War.*

Baumann, Fr. L. Quellen zur Gesch. des Bauernkrieges in Ober-Schwaben. Stuttgart 1877.
—— Die Zwolf Artikel der oberschwabischen Bauern. Kempten. 1896
—— Akten zur Gesch. des Bauernkrieges aus Oberschwaben. Freiburg 1881.
Bax, E. Belfort. The Peasants' War in Germany. London. 1899.
Beger, L. Zur Gesch. des Bauernkriegs nach Urkunden zu Karlsruhe. Forschungen zur Deutschen Gesch. Vols. XXI-II Gottingen. 1862-86.
Bensen, H. M. Gesch. des Bauernkrieges in Ostfranken. Erlangen. 1840.
Berlichingen, Gotz von. Lebensbeschreibung. Ed. Schonhuth. Heilbronn. 1858.
—— Geschichte von, by F. W. Berlichingen-Rossach. Leipzig. 1861.
Cornelius, C A. Studien zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges. Munich. 1861.
Cronthal, M. Die Stadt Wurzburg im Bauernkriege. Wurzburg. 1888.
Czerny, A. Der erste Bauernaufstand in Oberosterreich 1525. Linz. 1882
Ehrard, O. Der Bauernkrieg in Bamberg Beitr. Bayer. Kirchengesch. Vol. I. 1896.
Elben, A. Vorderösterreich in 1524 Strassburg. 1889.
Engbert, S. Der Massinger Bauernhaufe. Eichstatt. 1895.
Falckenheimer, W. Philipp der Grossmuthige im Bauernkriege. Marburg. 1887.
Fischer, E. W. Ueber die sogenannte Reformation Kais. Friedrichs III. Hamburg. 1858.
Friedrich, J. Astrologie und Reformation, oder die Astrologen als Prediger der Reformation und des Bauernkriegs. Munich. 1864.

Friess, Lorenz. Geschichte des Bauernkrieges in Ostfranken. Würzburg. 2 vols. 1876–83.
Götze, A. Die Artikel der Bauern, 1525. Hist. Vierteljahrschrift, 1901, pp. 1–32; 1902, pp. 1–33.
Haggenmüller, J. B. Geschichte der Stadt Kempten. 2 vols. Kempten. 1840–7.
Harer, P. Beschreibung des Bauernkrieges. Halle. 1881. (Cf. P. Sander in Deutsch. Zeitschrift Gesch. Wiss. N. F. I, 2.)
Hartfelder, C. Bauernkrieg in Südwest Deutschland. Stuttgart. 1884.
Herolt, J. Chronik; in Geschichtsquellen der Stadt Hall. Stuttgart. 1894.
Hoetzsch, Otto. Besitzverteilung und wirtsch.-soziale Gliederung der ländlichen Bevölkerung im 16 Jahrh. Leipziger Studien. Vol. VI. Part 4.
Jäger, C. Gesch. von Heilbronn. 2 vols. Heilbronn. 1828.
—— Markgraf Casimir und der Bauernkrieg. Nürnberg. 1892.
Jordan, R. Zur Gesch. der Stadt Muhlhausen in 1523–5. Muhlhausen. 1901.
Jörg, J. E. Deutschland in der Revolutionsperiode 1522–6 Freiburg. 1851.
Kautsky, Carl. Communism in Central Europe in the time of the Reformation. Engl. trans. London. 1897.
Kluckhohn, A. Ueber das Projekt eines Bauernparlamentes zu Heilbronn. Nachricht. von d. Gesellsch. der Wissensch. zu Gottingen. No. 7. 1893.
Lamprecht, K. Die Entwickelung des rheinischen Bauernstandes. Westdeutsche Zeitschr. für Gesch. Vol. VI
Lehnert, K. F. Studien zur Gesch. der Zwolf Artikel vom Jahre 1525. Halle. 1894.
Leist, F. Quellenbeitrage zur Gesch. des Bauernaufruhrs in Salzburg. Salzburg. 1888.
Lenz, M. Zur Schlacht bei Frankenhausen. Hist. Zeitschrift. LXIX.
Leodius, H. T. Der Bauernkrieg. In Freher's Scriptores. Vol. III. pp. 239 sqq.
Loserth, J. Die Stadt Waldshut und die vorderosterreichische Regierung in 1523–6. Vienna. 1891.
Lucke, W. Die Entstehung der "15 Bundesgenossen" des Joh. Eberlin von Günzburg. Halle. 1902.
Marquard, M. Kempten und der Bauernkrieg. Allgauer Geschichtsfreund. XIII. 1–22, 37–45.
Muck, Georg. Geschichte von Kloster Heilsbronn. 3 vols. Nordlingen. 1879–80.
Muller, L. Beitrage zur Gesch. des Bauernkrieges. Zeitschr. des hist. Vereins für Schwaben und Neuburg. Augsburg. 1889–91.
Münzer, Thomas. Aussgetrückte Emplossung des falschen Glaubens. Mühlhausen. 1524. Ed. R. Jordan. Mühlhausen. 1901.
—— Lives of, by O. Merx (includes also Heinrich Pfeiffer), Gottingen, 1889; G. Th. Strobel, Nürnberg, 1795, and J. K. Seidemann, Dresden, 1842.
Nabholz, A. Bauernbewegung in d. Ost-Schweiz 1524–5. Zurich. 1896.
Neumann, R. Zur Gesch. des Bauernkrieges. Frankfort. 1882.
Oechsle, E. F. Beitrage zur Geschichte des Bauernkrieges in den Schwäbisch-Fränkischen Gegenden. Heilbronn. 1844.
Prossl, J. Die Beschwerden d. bischofl. Bambergischen Unterthanen im Bauernkriege. Munich. 1901.
Rabenlechner, M. M. Der Bauernkrieg in Steiermark. Freiburg. 1901.
Radlkofer, M. Entstehungsgeschichte und Autorschaft der Zwölf Artikeln. Zeitschr. für d. h. Verein für Schwaben. Vol. XVI. 1889.
—— John Eberlin von Günzburg und Hans Jakob Welhe von Leipheim. Nördlingen. 1887.
Reiser, F. Reformation des K. Sigismund. 1876. (Cf. H. Werner in Hist. Vierteljschr. V, 467–86, and C. Koehne in N. Archiv. Vol. XXIII.)
Renouard de Bussière. Hist. de la guerre des paysans. Paris. 2 vols. 1852.

Riezler, S. In Sitzungsberichte der Münchener Akademie, Hist. Classe, 1891, pp. 708 sqq.
Riggenbach, B. Johann Eberlin von Günzburg. Tübingen. 1874.
Ryhiner, H. Chronik des Bauernkrieges. Basler Chroniken, VI, 461–504. 1902.
Sander, H. Vorarlberg zur Zeit des deutschen Bauernkrieges. Mühlbacher's Mittheilungen. IV. Innsbruck. 1880, etc.
Schmidt, J. H. Die '15 Bundesgenossen' d. Joh. Eberlin von Günzburg. Leipzig 1900.
Schrechenbach, P. F. Luther und der Bauernkrieg. Oldenburg. 1895.
Schreiber, H. Der deutsche Bauernkrieg. 3 vols. Freiburg i. B. 1863–6.
Sepp, J. N. Der bayerische Bauernkrieg. Munich. 1884.
Steitz, G. E. *Dr Gerhard Westerburg, der Leiter des Burgeraufstandes zu Frankfurt in 1525.* Archiv für Frankfurts Gesch. N. F. V, 192 sqq.
Stern, A. Ueber die Zwolf Artikel der Bauern. Leipzig. 1868.
—— Regesten zur Gesch. des Bauernkrieges vornehmlich in der Pfalz. Zeitschr. für Gesch. des Oberrheins. Vol XXIII. Karlsruhe 1870.
Stolze, W. Zur Vorgesch des Bauernkrieges. Staats- und Socialwissenschaft Forschungen. Vol. XVIII. Part 4 Leipzig. 1900.
Thomas, Max. *Markgraf Kasimir im Bauernkriege.* Breslau. 1898. Gotha. 1900.
Vogt, W. Die Vorgeschichte des Bauernkrieges. Halle. 1887.
—— Die bayrische Politik im Bauernkriege. Nordlingen 1883. [Chiefly against Jorg.]
—— Die Korrespondenz des Schwabischen Bundes-Hauptmanns 1524–7. 4 pts Augsburg 1879–83.
Wachsmuth, W. Der deutsche Bauernkrieg. Leipzig. 1834.
Waldau, G. E. Materialien zur Gesch. des Bauernkrieges. 3 pts. Chemnitz 1791–4.
Zimmermann, W. Allgemeine Gesch. des grossen Bauernkrieges. 3 vols. Stuttgart. 1841–3. 2nd ed. 1856.
Zopfl, H. Die Hauptmannschaft des Gotz von Berlichingen. Heidelberg. 1850.

(II) *Plot and counter-plot from* 1525 *to* 1529.

Balan, P. Clementis VII epistolae. (Vol. I of Monumenta saeculi XVI hist. illustrantia Innsbruck. 1885.)
Beclagung Teutscher nation über die unbillichen beschwerd und bezwingknus des Romischen stuls. Sine loco 1526.
Casanova, E. Lettere di Carlo V a Clemente VII 1527–33. Florence. 1893.
Ehsess, S. Gesch. der Pack'schen Handel. Freiburg i. B. 1881.
—— Landgraf Philipp von Hessen und Otto von Pack. Freiburg i. B. 1886.
Friedensburg, W. Der Reichstag zu Speier in 1526. Jastrow's Hist. Untersuchungen Part 5. Berlin. 1887.
—— Zur Vorgesch des Gotha-Torgauischen Bündnisses. Marburg. 1884.
—— Beitrage zum Briefwechsel zwischen Herzog Georg von Sachsen und Landgraf Philipp von Hessen. Neues Archiv fur Sachs. Gesch. Dresden. 1880, etc. Bd VI.
Grethen, R. Die politischen Beziehungen Clemens VII zu Karl V 1523–7. Hanover. 1887
Hellwig, W. Die politischen Beziehungen Clemens VII zu Karl V im Jahre 1526. Leipzig. 1889.
Joachim, E. Die Politik des letzten Hochmeisters in Preussen, Albrecht von Brandenburg. Berlin. 1892.
Karstens, W. Sachsisch-Hessische Beziehungen in 1524–6. Kiel. 1886.

Kluckhohn, A. Der Reichstag zu Speier im J. 1526. Sybel's Hist. Zeitsch. Munich. 1859 etc. Vol. LVI.

Ney, J. Analekten zur Gesch. des Reichstags zu Speier im J. 1526. Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. VIII, IX, XII. Hamburg. 1888.

Schomburgk, W. Die Pack'schen Handel. Maurenbrecher's Hist. Taschenbuch. Leipzig. 1882.

Schornbaum, K. Stellung d. Markgraf Kasimir, 1524–7. Erlangen. 1901.

—— Markgraf Georg und d. Sächsisch-Hessische Bündnissbestrebung von 1528. Beitr. zur bayer. Kirchengesch. VIII 193–212.

Schwarz, H. Landgraf Philipp und die Pack'schen Händel. Leipzig. 1881. (Cf. W. Schomburgk in Maurenbrecher's Taschenbuch. 1882.)

Stoy, St. Erste Bündnisbestrebungen evangelischer Stande. Jena. 1888.

Virck, H. Die Städte und das Bundniss der evangelischen Fürsten 1526–7. Weimar. 1887.

Von der Lith, J. W. Erlauterung der Reformation von 1524 bis 1528. Schwabach 1733.

(iii) *The organisation of Lutheran Churches.*

Berlit, G. Luther, Murner, und d. Kirchenlied des 16 Jahrh. Leipzig. 1899.

Bugenhagen, J. Kirchenordnungen für die Stadt Braunschweig. Wolfenbüttel. 1885

Burkhardt, C. A. Geschichte der deutschen Kirchen- und Schulvisitationen im Zeitalter der Reformation. Leipzig. 1879, etc.

Cohrs, F. Evangel. Katechismusversuche vor Luthers Enchiridion. 4 vols. Berlin. 1900–1902. (Cf. Beiträge zur bayer. Kirchengeschichte VIII 237–9.)

Fricke, F. Luthers kleiner Katechismus. Gottingen. 1897.

Friedrich, G. Luther und die Kirchenverfassung. Darmstadt. 1894.

Hartmann, Julius. Aelteste katechetische Denkmale der Ev. Kirche, oder die kleinen Katechismen von Brenz, Althammer, Lachmann, und Luther aus den Jahren 1527–9. Stuttgart. 1844.

Hase, C. A. Herzog Albrecht von Preussen und sein Hofprediger [J. Funck] Leipzig. 1879.

Kastner, A. Die Kinderfragen. Der erste deutsche Katechismus. Leipzig. 1902.

Lambert, François. Lives of, by Baum (Strassburg, 1840), F. W. Hassencamp (Elberfeld, 1860), Stieve (Breslau, 1867) and Louis Ruffet (Paris, 1873).

Planck, G. J. Geschichte der Entstehung, der Veranderungen und der Bildung unseres Protestantischen Lehrbegriffs. 6 vols. Leipzig. 1781–1800.

Richter, A. L. Die evangel. Kirchenordnungen des 16 Jahrh. 2 vols. Weimar 1846.

Sehling, E. Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des 16 Jahrh. Leipzig. 1902.

(iv) *The Protest of* 1529.

Jung, A. Geschichte des Reichstags zu Speier in 1529. Strassburg. 1830.

Muller, J. J. Hist. von der evangel. Stande Protestation und Apellation. Jena. 1705.

Ney, J. Geschichte des Reichstages zu Speier in 1529. Hamburg. 1880.

Tittmann, J. A. H. Die Protestation zu Speyer. Leipzig. 1829.

C. Chapter VII. The Conflict of Creeds and Parties.

(i) *The Conference at Marburg and Confession of Augsburg.*

Bess, B. Luther in Marburg 1529 (Preuss. Jahrb. CIV 418–31, Berlin, 1901).

Bresch, F. Strasbourg et la querelle sacramentaire. Montauban. 1902.

Brieger, Th. Beiträge zur Gesch. des Augsburg. Reichstages 1530. Zeitschr. für Kircheng. XII. 1891.
—— *Die Torgauer Artikel.* In Kirchengeschichtliche Studien. Leipzig. 1888.
Bucer, M. Historische Nachricht von dem Gespräch zu *Marburg.* Simler, Sammlung II, ii, 471 sqq.
Calinich, H. J. R. Luther und die Augsburgische Confession. Leipzig. 1861.
Erichson, A. Das Marburger Religionsgespräch. Strassburg. 1880.
Escher, H. Die Glaubensparteien in der Eidgenossenschaft und ihre Beziehungen zu den deutschen Protestanten 1527-31. Frauenfeld. 1882.
Facius, Moriz. Gesch. des Reichstages zu Augsburg. Leipzig. 1830. (Cf. books on the same subject published the same year by C. Fikenscher and C. Pfaff.)
Ficker, J. Die Konfutation des Augsburg. Bekenntnisses. Leipzig. 1891.
—— Das Konstanzer Bekenntniss. Tubingen. 1902.
—— Aktenstucke zu den Religionsverhandlungen des Reichstages zu Regensburg, 1532. Zeitschr. fur K. Gesch XII.
Forstemann, K. E. Urkundenbuch zu der Gesch. des Reichstags zu Augsburg. 2 vols. Halle. 1833-5.
Greiner. Briefwechsel Konrad Mocks...auf dem Reichstag zu Augsburg 1530. Wurttemb. Vierteljh VI. 52-107, VII. 50-88.
Jaeger, C. Die Augsb. Konfession der vier Stadte. Els.-Lothr. Protestantischer liberaler Verein. No XIV. 1880
Knaake, J. K. F. Luther's Anteil an der Augsburgischen Confession. Berlin. 1863.
Kolde, Th. Nurnberg und Luther vor dem Reichstag zu Augsburg. Kircheng. Studien. Leipzig. 1888.
Loaysa, G. de. Cartas al Carlos V 1530-2. Ed. G. Heine. Berlin. 1848.
Loscher, V. E. Historia Motuum. Leipzig. 1770.
Meyer, C. La réfutation de la confession d'Augsbourg. Alençon. 1896.
Morikofer, J. C. Ulrich Zwingli nach den urkundlichen Quellen. 2 pts. Leipzig. 1867-9.
Muller, E. F. K. Die Bekenntnisschriften d. reform. Kirche. Leipzig. 1902.
Paetzold, A. Die Konfutation des Vierstädtebekenntnisses. Leipzig. 1899.
Popowski, F. von. Kritik der handschriftlichen Sammlung des Joh. Faber zu der Gesch. des Augsburg. Reichstags in 1530. Konigsberg. 1880.
Salig, C. A. Vollstandige Hist. der Augsburg Confession. 4 pts Halle. 1730-45.
Ruckert, L. J. Luthers Verhaltnis zum Augsburgischen Bekenntniss. Jena. 1854.
Schirrmacher, F. W. Briefe und Akten zu der Gesch. des Religionsgespraches zu Marburg und des Reichstages zu Augsburg. Gotha. 1876.
Tschakert, P. Die Augsburgische Konfession Leipzig 1901.
—— Die bisher unbekannte Ulmer Handschrift der Augsb. Konfession. Theol. Studien und Kritiken, 1903, pp. 48-70
Uhlhorn, J. G. W. Die Reformation. Luther und die Schweizer. Hanover. 1868.
Virck, H. Melanchthons politische Stellung auf dem Reichstage zu Augsburg 1530. Zeitschr. fur Kirchengeschichte. Vol. IX. 1887.

(ii) *The Schmalkaldic League.*

Meurer, M. Der Tag zu Schmalkalden und die Schmalkaldischen Artikel. Leipzig. 1837.
Pfender, P. Les articles de Smalkalde. Paris. 1899.
Schmidt, G. Zur Geschichte des Schmalk. Bundes. Forsch. zur Deutschen Gesch. Vol. XXV.
Singer, P. Beziehung des Schmalkald. Bundes zu England. Greifswald. 1901.
Winckelmann, O Der Schmalkaldische Bund 1530-2 und der Nürnberger Religionsfriede. Strassburg. 1892.
Zangemeister, K. Die Schmalkaldischen Artikel vom Jahre 1537. Heidelberg. 1883.

(iii) *The Würtemberg War of* 1534.

Heyd, L. F. Die Schlacht bei Laufen. Stuttgart. 1834.
Wille, J. Philipp der Grossmütige von Hessen und die Restitution Ulrichs von Würtemberg 1526–35. Tubingen. 1882.
—— Analekten zur Gesch. Oberdeutschlands insbesondere Würtembergs 1534–40. Zeitschr. für Gesch. des Oberrheins. Karlsruhe 1858–68. Vol. XXXVII.
Winckelmann, O. Die Verträge von Kadan und Wien. Brieger's Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. XI, 212 sqq.

(iv) *The Anabaptists.*

Bax, E. Belfort. Rise and Fall of the Anabaptists. London. 1903.
Beck, Josef. Die Geschichtsbucher der Wiedertäufer in Oesterreich-Ungarn. Fontes Rer. Austr. Vol. XLIII.
Bullinger, H. Der Wiedertauferen Ursprung, Furgang, Secten, etc. Zurich. 1560.
Burckhardt, P. Die Basler Täufer. Basel. 1898.
Cornelius, C. A. Berichte der Augenzeugen uber das Wiedertäuferreich. Münster. 1853.
—— Geschichte des Münsterischen Aufruhrs. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1855–60.
—— Die Niederlandischen Wiedertaufer während der Belagerung Munsters. Munich. 1869.
—— Historische Arbeiten. Leipzig. 1899.
—— Die Eroberung der Stadt Munster. Raumer's Taschenbuch, 1872.
Detmer, H. Bilder an der relig. und sozial. Unruhen in Münster. Münster. 1902.
Egli, E. Die Zuricher Wiedertaufer. Zurich. 1878.
—— Die St Galler Taufer. Zurich. 1887.
Gresbeck, H. In Geschichtsquellen des Bisthums Munster. Vol. II. Münster. 1852.
Hase, C. A. Das Reich der Wiedertäufer. Leipzig. 1860.
Heath, R. Anabaptism 1521–36. London. 1895.
Heresbach, Conrad. Historia anabaptistica. Ed. Bouterwek. Elberfeld. 1866.
Hoffmann, Melchior. Prophecey oder weissagung aus heliger schrifft. Basel. 1530?
Hoffmeister, Johann. Dicta Memorabilia. Cologne. 1543.
Jochmus, H. Geschichte der Kirchenref. zu Münster und ihres Untergangs durch die Wiedtaufer. Munster. 1825.
Keller, L. Geschichte der Wiedertaufer und ihres Reichs zu Münster. Münster. 1880.
—— Die Wiederherstellung der Kathol. Kirche nach dem Wiedertäuferunruhen. Sybel's Hist. Zeitschr. XLVII 429 sqq.
—— Hans Denks Protestation und Bekenntniss. Monatschr. d. Comen -Gesellsch. VII 231–43.
—— Ein Apostel der Wiedertaufer [Hans Denck]. Preuss. Jahrbücher. September, 1882.
Kerssenbroch, Herman. Anabaptistici Furoris...hist. narratio. Ed. H. Detmer. Münster. 1899. (Cf. Detmer, Kerssenbroch's Leben und Schriften. Munster 1900.)
Kirchmair, Georg. Denkwurdigkeiten seiner Zeit 1519–53. Part I. In Fontes Rer. Austriacarum, I 417–534.
—— Das Bäptische Reich. Wurtemberg (?). 1563.
Kolde, Th. Zum Prozess des Johann Denk. Leipzig. Kirchengesch. Studien. 1888.
Kripp, J. von. Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. der Wiedertäufer in Tyrol.
Krohn, B. N. Geschichte der Wiedertäufer. Leipzig. 1758.

Linden, F. O. zur. Melchior Hofmann, ein Prophet der Wiedertäufer. Leipzig. 1885.
Melanchthon, P. Unterricht wider der Lere der Wiederteuffer verteutschtet durch Justus Jonas. Wittenberg. 1528.
—— Etliche Propositiones wider der Lehre der Widerteuffer. Wittenberg. 1535.
Menius, Justus. Von dem Geist der Widerteuffer. Wittenberg. 1544.
Neue Zeitung von den Wiedertäufferen und ihrer Sect. Strassburg (?). 1528.
Ottius, J. H. Annales Anabaptistici. Basel. 1572.
Rembert, K. Die Wiedertaufer im Herzogtum Julich. Berlin. 1899.
Renouard de Bussière, M. T. Les Anabaptistes. Hist. du Lutheranisme, de l'Anabaptisme et du règne de Jean Bockelsohn à Münster. Paris. 1853.
Rhegius, Urbanus. Disputation...wider alle Chiliasten. Ed. C. J. H. Fick. Hermannsburg. 1860.
Roth, Fr. Zur Geschichte der Wiedertäufer in Oberschwaben. Zeitschr. d. Vereins fur Schwaben, Vols. xxvii–viii, 1901–2.
Rothmann, Bernard. Schriften. Ed. E W. H. Hochhuth. Gotha. 1857. (Cf. H. Detmer, Beitrage zur Gesch. Bernhard Rothmanns in Monatsbll. d. Comenius-Gesells ix, 273–300, 1901.)
Tumbult, G Die Wiedertaufer; die sozial. und relig. Bewegungen zur Zeit der Reformation. Leipzig. 1899.
Winter, V. A. Geschichte der Bairischen Wiedertaufer. Munich. 1809.
(*See also* numerous articles in the Monatshefte d. Comenius-Gesellschaft.)

(v) *Lübeck and the 'Grafenfehde.'*

Alten, F. von. Graf Christoph von Oldenburg und die Grafenfehde. Hamburg. 1853.
Faulstitch, E. Zur Geschichte Stralsunds in der Zeit der Grafenfehde. Stralsund. 1902.
Gloy, A. Beitr. zur Gesch. der Leibeigenschaft in Holstein. Kiel. 1901.
Handelmann, H. Die letzten Zeiten der Hansischen Uebermacht. Kiel. 1853.
Koppmann, K. Zur Geschichte Dr Joh. Oldendorps. Beitr. zur Gesch. der Stadt Rostock, vol. iii.
Schafer, Dietrich. Geschichte von Danemark. Vol. iv. Gotha. 1893.
Schlozer, K. von. Verfall und Untergang der Hansa Berlin. 1853.
Waitz, G. Lubeck unter Jurgen Wullenweber und die Europäische Politik. Berlin. 3 vols. 1855–6.
Wurm, C F. Die politischen Beziehungen Heinrichs VIII zu Marcus Meyer und Jurgen Wullenwever. Hamburg. 1852.

(vi) *Lutherans and Catholics*, 1535–44.

Blatter, A. Thatigkeit Melanchthons bei den Unionsversuchen 1539–41. Bern. 1899.
Brandenburg, Erich. Herzog Heinrich der Fromme von Sachsen 1537–41. Dresden. 1896.
—— Polit. Korrespondenz Moritz von Sachsen. Vol i, to 1543. Leipzig. 1900.
Brieger, Th. G. Gasparo Contarini und das Regensburger Konkordienwerk d. J. 1541. Gotha. 1870.
Bucer, M. Dialogi oder Gesprech von der gemainsame und den Kirchenübungen der Christen. Augsburg. 1535
Dittrich, F. Nuntiaturbericht Morone's 1539–40. Paderborn. 1892.
—— Gasparo Contarini. Braunsberg. 1885.
—— Regesten und Briefe des Kardinals G. Contarini. Braunsberg. 1881.

Druffel, A. von. Ueber den Vertrag zwischen Karl V und dem Papst von Juni 1541. Deutsche Zeitsch. für Gesch. Vol. III, 1889.
Ettenius, Cornelius. Berichte über die Reise des Legaten Vorstius 1536–7. Ed. Arendt. Raumer's Hist. Taschenbuch, 1839.
Fraustadt, A. Die Einführung der Ref. im Hochstifte Merseburg. Leipzig. 1843.
Friedensburg, W. Zur Gesch. des Wormser Konvents 1541. Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. Vols. XXI—II, 1900–1.
—— Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland; published by the K. Preuss. hist. Institut in Rome I i 1892 (Despatches of Vergerio 1533–6); I ii 1898 (Despatches of Morone 1536–8); I iii–iv 1893 (Despatches of Aleander 1538–9).
Gachard, L. P. Trois Années de Charles-Quint 1543–6. Brussels. 1865.
Heide, G. Die Verhandlungen des Vizekanzlers Held 1537–8. Hist.-Polit. Blätter für d. kathol. Deutschland. Vol. CII. Munich.
Heppe, H. Urkundliche Beitrage zur Gesch. der Doppelehe des Landgrafs. Niedner's Zeitschr. XXII, 265 sqq.
Hoffmann, E. Naumburg im Zeitalter der Reformation. Leipziger Studien. Vol. VII, Part I, 1901. (Cf. F. Koster, Beiträge in Zeitschr. für Kirchen-Gesch. XXII, 145–59, 278–330.)
Kayser, C. Die reformatorischen Kirchenvisitationen in den welfischen Landen 1542–4. Gottingen. 1897.
Koldewey, F. Heinz von Wolfenbüttel. Halle. 1883.
Meinardus, O. Die Verhandlungen des Schm. Bundes von 14 bis 18 Feb. 1539. Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte. Göttingen. Vol. XXII.
Meine, F. Die Stellung Joachims II. Lüneburg. 1898.
Moses, R. Die Religionsverhandlungen in Hagenau und Worms, 1540–1. Jena. 1889
Pastor, L. Correspondenz Contarini's, 1541. Hist. Jahrbuch, 1880.
Schulte, F. X. Luther und die Doppelehe des Landgrafen von Hessen. Paderborn. 1869.
Schwarz, K. Römische Beitrage zu J. Groppers Leben und Wirken. Hist. Jahrbuch der Gorresgesellsch. Vol. VII.
Spiess, P. E. Gesch. des kaiserlich. neunjahrig. Bundes von 1535–44. Erlangen. 1788.
Traut, H. Kurfürst Joachim II von Brandenburg und der Turkenfeldzug vom Jahre 1542 Gummersbach. 1892.
Vetter, P. Die Religionsverhandlungen auf dem Reichstage zu Regensburg. Jena. 1899.
Weiss, C. Papiers du Cardinal de Granvelle. 4 vols. Paris. 1841–3. (Cf Correspondance du Cardinal de Granvelle. Brussels. 1897.)

(vii) *The Cleves War.*

Crecelius, W. Der geldrische Erbfolgestreit 1538–43. Zeitschr. des Bergischen Geschichtsvereins. Bonn 1863, etc. Vol XXIII.
Heidrich, Paul. Der geldrische Erbfolgestreit 1537–43. Cassel. 1896.

D. Chapter VIII. Religious War.

(i) *Authorities for the whole or the greater part of chapter.*

Brandenburg, E. Moritz von Sachsen. Vol. I. Leipzig. 1898.
Braunsberger, O. B. Petri Canisii epistolae et acta. Vol. I, 1541–56. Freiburg i. B. 1896.
Brunner, S. Korrespondenzen...Ferdinands I in kirchlichen Angelegenheiten 1546–59. Studien...aus den Benedictiner und Cistercienser Orden. Vol. V.

Calendar of State Papers. Foreign Series, 1547-53. London. 1861.
Cornelius, C. A. Zur Erläuterung d. Politik d. Churf. Moritz von Sachsen. Münchener Histor. Jahrbuch. Munich. 1866.
Dreytwein, Dion Esslingische Chronik 1548-64. Ed. A. Diehl. Tübingen. 1901.
Druffel, A. von. Briefe und Akten zur Gesch. d. XVI Jahrh. 1546-55. Vols. I-IV, 1873-96. Vol. V. Ed. W. Goetz. 1898.
Häberlin, F. D Neueste Deutsche Reichsgeschichte vom Anfang des Schmalk. Krieges. 28 vols. Halle 1774, etc
Haussleiter, J. Aus der Schule Melanchthons. Theologische Disputationen zu Wittenberg 1546-60. Greifswald 1897
Hortleder, Fr. Der römischen Keyser...Handlungen und Ausschreiben ..von den Ursachen des teutschen Krieges 2 pts Frankfurt. 1617-8. (Cf. M. Ritter in N Archiv fur Sachs Gesch. Dresden 1880 Vol. I.)
Issleib, S Moritz von Sachsen als protestantischer Furst. Hamburg. 1898.
Langenn, F. A. von. Melchior von Ossa. Leipzig. 1858.
—— Christoph von Carlowitz. Leipzig. 1854
—— Moritz von Sachsen. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1841
Massarelli, A. Tagebuch vom Concil zu Trient. Ed Dollinger. Vol. I. Nordlingen. 1876.
Maurenbrecher, W. Karl V und die Deutschen Protestanten 1545-55. Düsseldorf. 1865.
—— Kurfurst Moritz von Sachsen. Studien u. Skizzen z Gesch. d. Reformationszeit. Leipzig. 1874.
Pieper, A. Papstliche Legaten und Nuntien in Deutschland.... Part I, 1550-9. Munster 1897.
Reichenberger, R Wolfgang von Salm, Bischof von Passau 1540-1555. Freiburg. 1902.
Ribier, G Lettres et Memoires d'Estat Paris. 1666 2 vols.
Sastrow, Bartholomew. Memoirs. Ed. Mohnike, 3 vols., Greifswald, 1823-4; abridged translation published as Social Germany in Luther's Time. London. 1902.
Sehling, E Die Kirchengesetzgebung unter Moritz von Sachsen und Georg von Anhalt. Leipzig. 1899. (Cf. E. Brandenburg in Hist. Vierteljahrschr. 1901, pp 195-237.)
Sturm, Jakob Life of, by Baumgarten. Strassburg. 1876.
Sturm, John. La vie et travaux, by Ch. Schmidt. Strassburg. 1855.
Trent, Council of. Monumenta Tridentina. Ed Druffel. Vol. I. Munich. 1899.
—— Diariorum, Actorum, Epistt, Tractatuum nova collectio. Ed. Merkle. Gorresgesellschaft. Freiburg i. B. 1901.
Turba, G. Beitrage zur Gesch. der Habsburger 1548-1558 (reprinted from the Archiv fur Oester. Gesch. xc). Vienna 1901.
Voigt, G Moritz von Sachsen, 1541-7. Leipzig 1876.
Weiss, Ch Papiers d'Etat du Cardinal de Granvelle. 9 vols. Paris. 1841-52.
Wolf, Gustav. Deutsche Gesch im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation. Vol. I. Berlin. 1898-9.

(ii) *The Prelude to War* 1544-6.

Brandenburg, E Die Gefangennahme Herzog Heinrich's durch d. Schmalk. Bund. Leipzig 1894
—— Regensburger Vertrag zwischen d. Habsburgern und Moritz. Hist. Zeitschr. LXXX, 1—42.
Bruns, F. Vertreibung Heinrich's von Braunschweig. Marburg. 1889.
Caemmerer, H. von. Das Regensburger Religionsgespräch im Jahre 1546. Berlin. 1901.

Drouven, G. Die Ref. in d. Colnischen Kirchenprovinz zur Zeit...Hermann von Wied. Cologne. 1876.
Druffel, A. von. Karl V und die Römische Kurie 1544–6. Abhandl. d. Münchener Akad., 1877, 1881, 1890.
Friedensburg, W. Am Vorabend des Schmalkaldischen Krieges. Quellen aus Ital. Archiv. 1897, II, 140–51.
—— Die Kriegsvorbereitungen Karls V. Ib. VII, 63–71.
—— Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland; published by the K. Preuss. hist. Institut in Rome I viii. (Despatches of Verallo 1545–6.) Gotha. 1898.
Gachard, L. P. Trois Années de Charles Quint 1543–6. Brussels. 1865.
Hasenclever, A. Die Politik der Schmalkaldener vor Ausbruch des Schmalk. Krieges. Berlin. 1901.
Kannengiesser, P. Der Reichstag zu Worms 1544–5. Strassburg. 1891.
—— Die Kapitulation zwischen Karl V und Paul III gegen den Protestanten 1546. Strassburg. 1888.
Paulus, N. Luthers Lebensende, Freiburg, 1898. (Cf. also the references in Janssen's Deutsche Gesch., English transl. VI, 281–2.)
Schmidt, G. Zur Gesch. des Schmalkalder Bundes Dec. 1545—Feb. 1546. Forschungen zur Deutschen Gesch. XXV. 1885.
Springer, J. Beitrage zur Gesch. des Wormser Reichstags 1544–5. Leipzig. 1882.
Ursprung und Ursach gegenwertiger Uffrur. Wittenberg. 1546
Varrentrapp, C. Hermann von Wied und sein Reformationsversuch in Köln Leipzig. 1878.
Voigt, G Moritz von Sachsen 1541–7. Leipzig. 1876.
—— Der Bund mit den Habsburgern 1546. Archiv für Sachs. Ges. N. F. III.

(iii) *The Schmalkaldic War* 1546–7.

Avila, Luis de. Comment. de la guerra de Alemania ed. 1858. [Charles V's 'commentaries' dealing with the war are largely based on Avila; Avila's book roused resentment among the German Princes; for a criticism of it attributed to Schartlin see Mencke, Scriptt 1730, vol. III.]
Baumgarten, H. Zur Gesch. des Schmalk. Krieges. Sybel's Hist. Zeitschr. Vol. XXXVI. 1876.
Christmann, Curt. Melanchthons Haltung im Schm. Kriege. Berlin. 1902.
Druffel, A. von. Des Viglius von Zwichem Tagebuch des Schmalkald. Donaukrieges. Munich. 1877.
—— Beitrag zur militarischen Wurdigung des Schmalkald Krieges. Munich. 1882
Etliche kurtze gesprache die jetzige kriegsleuff im Teutschenland belangend. Sine loco. 1546
Fischer, Karl. Die Stifte Magdeburg und Halberstadt im Schm. Kriege. Berlin. 1895.
Friedensburg, W. Nuntiatur des Verallo 1546–7. Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland. Div. I. Vol. IX. 1899.
Höllander, A. Strassburg im Schmalkald. Kriege. Strassburg. 1881.
Issleib, S. Die Wittenberger Kapitulation vom Jahre 1547. Neues Archiv fur Sachs. Gesch 1891.
Jahn, J. G. Geschichte des Schmalkaldischen Krieges. Leipzig. 1837.
Kannengiesser, P. Karl V und Maximilian von Egmont, Graf von Buren. Freiburg i. B. 1895.
Ladurner, P. J. Der Einfall der Schmalkaldener in Tirol. Archiv für Gesch. Tirols. Innsbruck. I, 145 sqq.
Le Mang, R. L. Die Darstellung des Schmalk. Krieges in den Denkwürdigkeiten Karls V. 3 parts. Jena, Leipzig and Dresden. 1890, 1899, 1900.

Lenz, M. Die Kriegsführung der Schmalkaldener gegen Karl V an der Donau. Sybel's Hist. Zeitschr. Vol. XLIX. 1883.
—— Die Schlacht von Mühlberg. Gotha. 1879.
Mugnier, F. Faictz et Guerre de Charles-Quint dans l'Allemagne 1546–7. Paris. 1902.
Neue Zeitung des jetzigen Krieges. Sine loco. 1546.
Riezler, S. Die Baierische Politik im Schmalkald. Krieg. Hist. Abhandl. der Baier. Akad. XXI. 1894.
Schärtlin von Burtenbach Lebensbeschreibung. Frankfort. 1777. (Cf. Th. Herberger, Schartlin und seine an die Stadt Augsburg geschriebenen Briefe, Augsburg, 1852, and Schonhuth, Leben und Thaten Schertlins, Münster, 1858.)
Stenius, Simon. Versio et Supplicatio...descr. belli Schmalkald. In Freher's Scriptt. 1717, vol. III.
Summarium dess evangelischen, das ist des Schmalkaldischen Kriegs. Anon. Sine loco. 2 pts. 1548.
Tieftrunk, K. Odpor stavův českých proti Ferdinandovi I. (The revolt of the Cech estates against Ferdinand in the spring of 1547.) Prague. 1872.
Voigt, G. Geschichtsschreibung uber den Schmalkaldischen Krieg. Leipzig. 1874.
Wenck, W. Die Wittenberger Kapitulation von 1547. Sybel's Hist. Zeitschr. Vol. XX. (Cf. S. Issleib in N. Archiv fur Sachs. Gesch. Vol. XII.)

(iv) *Charles V and his victory.*

Ascham, Roger. Epistolarum libri quatuor. Oxford. 1703.
—— A Report and Discourse of the affairs of Germany during certain years while the said Roger was there. London. 1570? (Cf. A. Katterfeld, Roger Ascham. Strassburg 1879.)
Beutel, G. Ueber den Ursprung des Augsburger Interims. Leipzig. 1888.
Bossert, G. Das Interim in Wurtemberg Halle. 1895.
Briefwechsel des Herzogs Christoph von Wurttemberg 1550–4. Stuttgart. 2 vols. 1899–1901.
Druffel, A. von. Die Sendung des Kardinals Sfondrato an den Hof Karls V 1547–8. Munich. 1892.
Friedberg, E. Agenda.... Ein Beitrag zur Gesch. des Interims [in Saxony]. Halle. 1869.
Gossart, E. Charles V et Philippe II. Brussels. 1896.
—— Notes pour servir à l'hist. du règne de Charles V. Brussels. 1897.
Herrmann, F. Das Interim in Hessen. Marburg. 1901.
Horning, W. Briefe von Strassburger Reformatoren u. a. uber die Einfuhrung des Interims in Strassburg (1548–54). Strassburg. 1887.
Jacobs, Ed. Johann Meinerzhagen und das Interim. Elberfeld. 1893.
Kupke, G. Nuntiaturen d. Bertano und Camaiani 1550–2. Nuntiaturberichte hrsg. durch d. k preussischen Institut in Rom. Vol. XII. 1900.
Loserth, J. Die Registratur Erzherzog Maximilians aus den Jahren 1547–1551. Fontes Rerum Austr. XLVIII.
Meinardus, O. Der Katzenelnbogische Erbfolgestreit. Wiesbaden. 2 vols. 1898, 1902. [Contains documents etc. about Philip of Hesse's imprisonment, and controverts Turba, Issleib, and Brandenburg.]
Melanchthon, P. Bedencken auffs Interim s l. 1548. Eng. transl. London. 1548.
Meyer, Chr. Zur Gesch. des Interim in Brandenburg-Anspach. Hohenzollerische Forschungen VI, 323–46.
—— Der Augsburger Reichstag nach einem furstlichen Tagebuch. Preuss. Jahrb. 1898, 206–242
Rachfall, F. Die Trennung der Niederlande vom deutschen Reiche. West-Deutsche Zeitschr. Vol. XIX, pt 2. 1900.

Turba, G. Verhaftung und Gefangenschaft des Landgr. Philipp. Vienna. 1896. (Cf. Meinardus above, S. Issleib, Die Gefangenschaft des Landgr. in N. Archiv für Sächs. Gesch. 1893, vol. xiv, and L. Schädel in Mittl. d. Oberhessischen Gesch. Vereins, Neue Folge, xi, 31–56.)

Waldeck, Wolrad von. Tagebuch während des Reichstages zu Augsburg 1548. Ed. C. L. Tross. Stuttgart. 1861.

Wolf, G. Das Augsburger Interim. Zeitschr. für Gesch. d. Wissensch. N. F. ii, 1.

(v) *The War of Liberation.*

Barge, H. Die Verhandlungen zu Linz und zu Passau im Jahre 1552. Stralsund. 1893, 1897.

Des Moustiers-Mérinville. L'évèque de Bayonne, sa vie et correspondance. Limoges. 1895. [Useful for the bishop's negotiations with respect to the treaty of Friedwald.]

Fischer, G. Die personliche Stellung und polit. Lage Ferdinands vor und während der Passauer Verhandlungen. Konigsberg. 1891.

Goetz, W. Die bayerische Politik im ersten Jahrzehnt der Regierung Herzog Albrecht V. Munich. 1896.

Issleib, S. Moritz von Sachsen gegen Karl V bis zum Kriegzuge 1552. N. Arch. für Sächs. Gesch. vol. vi, 1885; the same continued, ibid. vol. vii, 1886.

—— Magdeburgs Belagerung durch Moritz. Ib. vol. v, 1884.

Kanngiesser, R. Der Zug Georgs von Mecklenburg ins Erzstift Magdeburg in 1550. Magdeburg 1888.

Kiewning, H. Albrechts von Preussen und Markgraf Johanns von Brandenburg Antheil am Furstenbund gegen Karl V. Königsberg. 1889. (Cf. Altpreuss. Monatsch. xxvi and Forschungen zur Brandenb Gesch. vol. iv.)

Neumann, R. Die Politik d. Vermittlungspartei in 1552 bis zum Beginn der Verhandlungen zu Passau. Greifswald. 1896.

Radlkofer, M. Der Zug Kurf. Moritz 1552. Zeitschr. des hist. Vereins fur Schwaben. Vol xvii. 1890

Scherer, H. Der Raub der drei Bisthumer in 1552. Raumer's Hist. Taschenbuch. 1842.

Schirrmacher, F. W. Johann Albrecht I, Herzog von Mecklenburg. 2 pts. Wismar. 1885.

Schlomka, E. Die polit. Beziehungen zwischen Moritz und Heinrich II 1550–2. Halle. 1884.

Schönherr, D. Gesammte Schriften. Ed M. Mayr. 2 vols. Innsbruck. 1899–1902.

Voigt, J. Der Furstenbund gegen Karl V. Raumer's Hist Taschenbuch. 1857.

Von dem Kriege vor Magdeburg. In Chroniken der deutschen Stadte, vol. xxvii, pt v. Leipzig. 1899.

Warnecke, A. Die diplomatische Thatigkeit des Lazarus von Schwendi. Göttingen. 1890.

Wenck, W. Albertiner und Ernestiner nach d. Wittenberg. Kapitulation. Archiv fur Sächs. Gesch. Vol. viii.

—— Kurfürst Moritz und Herzog August. Ib. vol. ix.

—— Kurfürst Moritz und die Ernestiner in 1551–2. Forschungen zur deutschen Gesch. Vol. xii.

Witter, J. Die Beziehung und der Verkehr des Kurf. Moritz mit König Ferdinand 1547–52. Jena. 1886.

(vi) *From the Treaty of Passau to the Peace of Augsburg.*

Brandi, K. Der Augsburger Religionsfriede. Munich. 1896.
Chabert, F. M. Journal du siège de Metz. Metz. 1857.
Druffel, A. Beiträge zur Reichsgeschichte 1553-5, ed. K. Brandi. Munich. 189
Ernst, V. *Die Entstehung der Executionsordnung von 1555.* Württemb. Viertel x. 1-110.
Griessdorf, H C. J. Der Zug Karls V gegen Metz. Halle. 1891.
Hollander, A. Strassburg im französischen Kriege 1552. Strassburg. 1888.
Issleib, S. Von Passau bis Sievershausen. N. Archiv für Sachs. Gesch. Vol. VIII 1887.
Joel, F. August von Sachsen bis zur Erlangung d. Kurwürde. N. Archiv fü Sachs. Gesch. Vol. XIX, 1898.
Meyer, Chr. Zur Gesch. d. markgrafl. Krieges 1553-4. Hohenzollerische For schungen v, 298-368, vi, 52-107.
Ritter, M. Der Augsburger Religionsfriede. Raumer's Hist. Taschenbuch. 1882
Spieler, Ch. W. Geschichte des Augsburger Religionsfriedens. Schleiz. 1854.
Trefftz, J. Kursachsen und Frankreich 1552-6. Leipzig. 1891.
Voigt, J. Markgraf Albrecht Alcibiades. 2 vols. Berlin. 1852.
Schwabe, L. Kursachsen und die Verhandlungen uber den Augsburger Religions frieden. N. Archiv für Sachs. Gesch. Dresden. Vol x
Wolf, G. Der Augsburger Religionsfriede. Stuttgart. 1890.

CHAPTER IX.

THE REFORMATION IN FRANCE.

I. ORIGINAL DOCUMENTS.

Albèri, E. Le relazioni degli ambasciadori Veneti. I^a serie. I–IV. Florence. 1839–60.

Argentré, C. du Plessis de (Bishop of Tulle). Collectio judiciorum de novis erroribus. I, II. Paris. 1728.

Aymon, T. Tous les synodes nationaux des églises réformées de France. I. The Hague. 1710. (Contains also letters of Cardinal Santa Croce.)

Becker, P. A. Marguerite, duchesse d'Alençon, et Guillaume Briçonnet, évêque de Meaux, d'après leur correspondance manuscrite (1521–24). Bulletin de la Société de l'Histoire du protestantisme français. Ed. N. Weiss. XLIX. Paris. 1900. (Subsequently cited as Bull. prot. franç.)

Bourrilly, V. L. François I^er et les Protestants. Les essais de concorde en 1535. Bull. prot. franç. XLIX. Paris. 1900.

—— Jean Sleidan et le Cardinal du Bellay. Ib. L. 1901.

——, Lazare de Bayf et le Landgrave de Hesse. Ib.

Bulæus, C. E. Historia universitatis Parisiensis. VI. Paris. 1673.

Calendar of State Papers. Foreign series. I–VI. London. 1861–6; Venetian. II–VII, ib. 1867–90; Letters and Papers of Henry VIII. III–XVI, ib. 1867–98. (*For further particulars see Bibliographies to Chaps. XIII–XVI.*)

Calvin, J. Opera, ed G. Baum, E. Cunitz and E. Reuss. XI–XIX. (Letters.) Brunswick 1873–9.

Castelnau, M. de. Mémoires. Ed. J. le Laboureur. I. Brussels. 1731.

Catalogue des actes de François I^er. I–VII. Paris. 1887–96. (To be completed in 10 volumes, the last three containing a bibliography and indices.)

Cimber, L, et Daujon, F. Archives Curieuses. 1^e série. Paris. 1835. IV. Histoire du tumulte d'Amboise

Collection des documents inédits. Lettres de Catherine de Medicis. Ed. H. de la Ferrière. I. 1880. Négociations du règne de François II. Ed. A. L. Paris. 1841. Perrenot, A, Card. de Granvelle. Papiers d'État. Ed. C. Weiss. III–VI. 1842–6.

Condé. Mémoires de Condé. I–III. The Hague. 1743.

Crespin, J. Histoire des Martyrs. Ed. D. Benoist (from the edition of 1619). I, II. Toulouse. 1885–7.

Delisle, L. Notice sur un registre des procès-verbaux de la faculté de théologie de Paris pendant les années 1503–1533. Paris. 1899. [The MS. of this register, which formerly belonged to the Duc de la Trémoïlle, is now in the Bib. nationale.]

Durand de Maillane, P. T. Les libertés de l'église gallicane. 5 vols. Lyons. 1771.

Este, Ippolito de (Cardinal of Ferrara). Négociations. Paris. 1658.

Herminjard, A. L. Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les pays de langue française. 9 vols. published, reaching to the year 1544. Geneva and Paris. 1866–97.

Isambert, F. A. Recueil général des anciennes lois françaises. XII–XIV. Paris. 1828–9. (This will be superseded for the reign of Francis I by the Ordonnances des Rois de France. Vol. I (1515, 1516) published 1902.)

Layard, Sir A. H. Despatches of Michele Suriano and Marcantonio Barbaro, Venetian Ambassadors at the Court of France, 1560–1563. Publications of the Huguenot Society of London. Lymington. 1891.

L'Hospital, Michel de. Œuvres. Ed. P. J. S. Dufey de l'Yvonne I, II. Paris. 1824.

Ribier, G. Lettres et Mémoires d'Estat. I. Paris. 1666.

Weiss, N. La chambre ardente. Paris. 1889.

II. HISTORIES, MEMOIRS AND OTHER NARRATIVES WHOLLY OR IN PART CONTEMPORARY.

Haton, Claude. Mémoires. Ed. F. Bourquelot. Coll. des doc. inéd. I. Paris. 1857.

Histoire Ecclésiastique des églises réformées au royaume de France. (A compilation edited under the direction of Beza. Antwerp. 1580. Ed. G. Baum and E. Cunitz. 3 vols. Paris. 1883–9.)

Journal d'un bourgeois de Paris sous le règne de François premier. Ed. L. Lalanne for the Soc. de l'hist. de France. Paris. 1854.

Languet, Hubert. Epistolae secretae. Part II. Halle. 1699.

[La Place, P. de] Commentaires de l'Estat de la Religion et Republique sous les Rois Henry et François seconds, et Charles neufieme. 1565. Reprinted in the Panthéon littéraire. Ed. J. A. C. Buchon. Paris. 1836.

Pasquier, Estienne. Lettres. Book IV. Paris. 1586.

[Regnier de la Planche, L.] Histoire de l'Estat de France sous le règne de François II. 1576. Ed. E. Mennechet. 2 vols. Paris. 1836.

Rœmond, Florimond de. L'histoire de la naissance, progrès et décadence de l'hérésie de ce siècle. Book VII. Paris. 1605.

Santa Croce, P. (Cardinal) De civilibus Galliae dissensionibus. In Martène et Durand, Vet. Script. et Monum. amplissima collectio. V. 1426–75. Paris. 1729.

Saulx-Tavannes, Gaspard de. Mémoires. [At the château de Sully. 1617.] Michaud et Poujoulat. VIII. Petitot. XXVI–XXVIII.

Serres, Jean de. Commentarii de statu religionis et reipublicae in regno Galliae. Part I. [Geneva.] 1571.

Thou, J. A. de. Historiae sui temporis. I, II. Bks I–XXIX. Paris. 1604–6. Ed. S. Buckley. London. 1733.

III. LATER WORKS.

A. General Histories of French Protestantism.

In order of publication.

Aubigné, Théodore Agrippa de. Histoire Universelle. Books I, II. Maillé. 1616. Ed. A. de Ruble for the Soc. de l'hist. de France. I. Paris. 1886.

Soldan, W. G. Geschichte des Protestantismus in Frankreich bis zum Tode Karls IX. I. Leipzig. 1855.

Polenz, G. von. Geschichte des franzosischen Calvinismus. I. Gotha. 1857.

Lutteroth, H. La réformation en France pendant la première période. Paris. 1859.

Baird, H. M. History of the rise of the Huguenots of France. I. New York. 1879. London. 1880.

B. ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORIES.

Gerdes, D. Introductio in historiam Evangelii seculo xvi passim per Europam renovati doctrinaeque Reformationis. I–IV. Groningen. 1744–52.

Guettée, l'Abbé. Histoire de l'Église de France. VIII, IX. Paris. 1856.

Hottinger, J. H. Historiae ecclesiasticae Novi Testamenti Enneas. VII. 713 ff. Hanover. 1665.

Lichtenberger, F. L. Encyclopédie des Sciences religieuses. 13 vols. Paris. 1877–82.

Pallavicini, Sforza. Istoria del concilio di Trento. Ed. F. A. Zaccaria. I, II. Rome. 1833.

Raynaldus, O. Annales Ecclesiastici. Ed. A. Theiner. XXXI–XXXIV. Bar-le-Duc and Paris. 1877–79.

C. HISTORIES OF PROTESTANTISM IN PARTICULAR CITIES AND PROVINCES.

Arnaud, E. Histoire des Protestants de Dauphiné. I. Paris. 1876.

—— Histoire des Protestants de Provence, du Comtat Venaissin et de la principauté d'Orange 2 vols. Paris. 1884.

Coquerel, A. fils. Précis de l'histoire de l'église réformée de Paris, 1572–1594. Paris. 1862.

Corbière, P. Histoire de l'église réformée de Montpellier. Montpellier and Paris. 1861.

Dieterlen, H. Le synode général de Paris, 1559. Paris. 1873

Floquet, A. Histoire du Parlement de Normandie. II. Rouen. 1840.

Gaullieur, E. Histoire de la réforme à Bordeaux et dans le ressort du Parlement de Guienne. I. Paris. 1884.

Hauser, H. La réforme en Auvergne. Bull. prot. franç. XLVII, XLVIII. 1898, 1899.

Leroux, A. Histoire de la réforme dans la Marche et le Limousin. Limoges. 1888.

Lièvre, A. Histoire des Protestants du Poitou I. Paris. 1856.

Moutarde, E. Étude historique sur la réforme à Lyon. Geneva. 1881.

Naef, F. La réforme en Bourgogne Paris. 1901

Puech, A. La Rénaissance et la Réformation à Nismes Nîmes. 1893.

Robert-Labarthe, U. de. Histoire du Protestantisme dans le Haut Languedoc. 2 vols. Paris. 1895–6.

Rossier, L. Histoire des Protestants de Picardie. Paris. 1861.

Vaurigaud, B. Essai sur l'histoire des églises réformées de Bretagne, 1535–1808. I. Paris. 1870.

Viénot, J. Histoire de la réforme dans le pays de Montbéliard, 1524–1573. I. Montbéliard. 1900

See for the bibliography of this section the sale-catalogue of the library of Henri Bordier, nos. 277–354, Paris, 1889, and, for recent works, H. Hauser in Rev. hist. XXVI. 85 ff., 1901.

D. BIOGRAPHIES.

Atkinson, C. T. Michel de l'Hospital. London. 1900.

Baird, H. M. Theodore Beza. New York. 1899.

Baum, J. W. Theodor Beza. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1843–52.

Bersier, E. Coligny avant les guerres de religion. Paris. 1884.

Bouillé, R. de. Histoire des Ducs de Guise. I, II. Paris. 1849.

Buisson, F. Sébastien Castellion. I. Paris. 1892.

Decrue, F. Anne de Montmorency. 2 vols. Paris. 1885 and 1889.

Delaborde, J. Gaspard de Coligny. I. Paris. 1879.
Doumergue, E. Jean Calvin. I, II. Lausanne. 1899, 1903.
Forneron, H. Les Ducs de Guise. I. Paris. 1877.
Graf, K. H. Jacobus Faber Stapulensis. Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie. Hamburg and Gotha. 1852.
Guillemin, J. J. Le Cardinal de Lorraine. Paris. 1847.
Haag, Eugène and Émile. La France Protestante. 10 vols. Paris. 1846–58. 2nd ed. Ed H. Bordier 6 vols. (to GAS) published. Paris. 1877–88.
Lefranc, A. La jeunesse de Calvin. Paris. 1888.
Marcks, E. Gaspard von Coligny. Stuttgart. 1892.
Pinvert, L. Lazare Baif. Paris. 1900.
Ruble, A. de. Antoine de Bourbon et Jeanne d'Albret. 2 vols. Paris. 1881–2.
Schmidt, C. Gerard Roussel. Strassburg. 1845.

E. MISCELLANEOUS.

Bourrilly, V L. Les préliminaires des guerres de religion. Bull. prot. franç. XLV. 1896.
Bower, H. M. The fourteen of Meaux. London. 1894.
Hauser, H. La propagation de la Réforme en France. Revue des cours et conférences. Paris. 1894.
—— La Renaissance et la Réforme en France, 1512–52. Revue historique. LXIV. Paris. 1897.
—— The French Reformation and the French People in the Sixteenth Century. American Historical Review. IV. New York. 1899
Klipffel, H. Le colloque de Poissy. Paris and Metz. 1867.
Lefranc, A. Les idées religieuses de Marguerite de Navarre, d'après son œuvre poétique. Paris. 1898.
—— Un nouveau registre de la faculté de théologie de Paris au XVIe siècle. Bull. prot. franç. 1902
Madelin, L. Les premières applications du Concordat de 1516 d'après les dossiers du Château Saint-Ange. École française de Rome. Mélanges d'archéologie et d'histoire. XVII. Paris 1887.
Mignet, F. Lettres de Jean Calvin. Journal des Savants. 1856, 1858, 1859. Paris.
Paillard, C. Additions critiques à l'histoire de la conjuration d'Amboise. Rev. hist XIV. Paris. 1880.
Philippson, M Westeuropa im Zeitalter von Philipp II, Elizabeth und Heinrich IV. Oncken's Allgemeine Geschichte. III, 2, pp. 1–113. Berlin. 1882.
Picot, G. Histoire des États Généraux. II. Paris. 1872.
Ranke, L. von. Französische Geschichte, vornehmlich in 16ten und 17ten Jahrhundert. I. Stuttgart and Tubingen. 1852. Vol. VIII of Sammtliche Werke. Berlin. 1874 etc.
Roget, A. Histoire de Genève. I–VI. Geneva. 1870–81.
Rolland, R. Le dernier procès de Berquin. École française de Rome. Mélanges. XII Paris. 1892.
Ruble, A. de. Le colloque de Poissy. Mémoires de la Société de l'hist. de Paris et de l'Île de France. XVI. Paris. 1889.
Schmidt, C. Die Unions-Versuche Franz I. Zeitschr. fur die historische Theologie. Leipzig. 1850.
Sthyr, H. V. (Bishop). Lutheranerne i Frankrig i Aarene 1524–26. Copenhagen. 1879.

Numerous short notices, besides the longer articles cited above, will be found in the Bulletin de la Société de l'histoire du protestantisme français; ed. Weiss. Paris.

CHAPTER X.

THE HELVETIC REFORMATION.

I.

A. BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

Brandstetter, J. L. Repertorium uber die in Zeit- und Sammelschriften der Jahre 1812–1890 enthaltenen Aufsatze und Mittheilungen schweizergeschichtlichen Inhaltes. Basel. 1892

Finsler, G. Zwingli-Bibliographie. Zurich. 1897.

An appendix to the above by the same author, in Zwingliana, 1902, No. 1 (pp. 287–90), brings it up to date

—— Bibliographie der schweizerisch-reformierten Kirchen. Vol. I. Die deutschen Kantone. In Bibliographie der schweizerischen Landeskunde. 1896.

Haller, G. E. von. Verzeichniss der Bucher und Schriften betreffend die Reformationsgeschichte, mitgetheilt von C. Siegwart-Muller, in Archiv für die schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte, vol. I (1868), following Haller's Bibliothek der schweizer. Geschichte, 1785 etc.; after Haller's death in 1786 the collection was continued, and completed up to 1871, by R. P. Gall-Morel in Archiv f d. schw. Reform Gesch, vol. III (Freiburg, 1876), pp 1 ff

Mülinen, J. E. F. von. Prodromus einer schweiz. Historiographie. Bern. 1874.

Sinner, L. von. Bibliographie der Schweizergeschichte. Bern. 1851.

Strickler, J. Neuer Versuch eines Litteratur-Verzeichnisses zur schweiz. Reformationsgeschichte enthaltend die zeitgenossische Litteratur, 1521–1532. In Actensammlung, etc, ed by Strickler. Vol. V, part 2.

Wyss, G. v. Geschichte der Historiographie in der Schweiz. Zurich. 1894.

References should also be made to Anzeiger fur schweizerische Geschichte: herausgegeben von der Allgemeinen geschichtsforschenden Gesellschaft der Schweiz (Bern) for continuations. A useful English sketch of the literature for the general history of Switzerland is given in Vincent, Government in Switzerland (New York, 1900), pp. 341–360. R. Stahelin has published accounts of Swiss Reformation historical works in Brieger's Zeitschrift f. Kirchengeschichte: for 1875–78 in vol. III (1879), pp. 547 ff. : for 1879–82 in vol. VI (1884), pp. 429 ff.

B. GUIDES TO MS. MATERIAL.

Erichson. Zwingli-Autographen in Elsass. Ibid 1886, pp 111–114.

Escher, H. Verzeichniss der Zwingli-Autographen aus der Stadtbibliothek und der Kantonsbibliothek in Zürich. Ibid. 1885, pp 217 ff.

Archiv für schweiz. Reformationsgeschichte, I, II, III, contain much information on single groups. Escher's Glaubensparteien is largely based on unpublished mss.

Mohr, T. von. Regesten der Archive der schweiz. Eidgenossenschaft auf Anordnung der schweiz. Geschichtlichen Gesellschaft. (Vol. I contains Einsiedeln, Canton Bern before the Reformation, Rapperschwyl, Abbey of Pfäffers, etc. by various writers.)

Rott, E. Inventaire sommaire de documents relatifs à l'Histoire de la Suisse conservés dans les Archives et Bibliothèques de Paris, et spécialement de la Correspondance échangée entre les Ambassadeurs de France aux Ligues et leur gouvernement, 1440–1700. [Part I is for 1444–1610, and Part V contains the Index.]

Schweizer, P. Verzeichniss der Zwingli-Autographen aus dem Staatsarchiv in Zürich. In Theologische Zeitschrift aus der Schweiz, ed. Meili, 1885, pp 196 ff. with note on p 232. Zurich.

Stahelin, R. Zwingli-Autographen in Basel. Ibid. 1886, pp. 53–54.

The MSS have been largely worked over and printed, especially those for Zwingli's life The Civic and Cantonal libraries are mostly catalogued. For foreign, diplomatic, and theological relations other libraries, although largely worked, have still material: e.g. Marburg, Stuttgart, Strassburg, and Innsbruck.

II.

A. EDITIONS OF WORKS.

Huldrici Zwinglii Opera. Schuler and Schulthess. 8 vols. Zurich. 1828–42. Supplement by Schulthess and Marthaler. Zurich. 1861.

A new edition by Dr Emil Egli and Dr Georg Finsler is in preparation, to be published at Berlin, under the patronage of the Zwingli-Verein in Zurich.

The fundamental edition was that of Froschauer, edited by Rudolph Gualter, 1544–5: the vernacular works were translated into Latin.

A useful hand-book, arranged by subjects, is Huldreich Zwingli's Sammtliche Schriften in Auszuge, von L. Usteri und S Vogelin. Zurich. 1819–20. 2 vols.

For single works see the Bibliography by Finsler (*above*).

III

CHRONICLES, DOCUMENTS AND LETTERS.

A. General Chronicles.

Anshelm, V. Berner Chronik vom Anfang der Stadt Bern bis 1526. 6 vols. Bern. 1825–33. Also Bern, 1884.

Bullinger, H Reformationsgeschichte. Edited by Hottinger and Vogeli. Frauenfeld. 1838–40

Edlibach, G., mit Einleitung von J. M. Usteri. Mitteilung der antiquarischen Gesellschaft in Zurich. Vol. IV. Zurich. 1846.

Kessler. Sabbata. Chronik der Jahre 1523–39: von Ernst Götzinger. St Gallen, 1866–8. Mitteilungen z. vaterlandischen Geschichte. St Gallen. hist. Verein. Vols. V–X. A new edition with commentary is announced by Egli and Schoch.

Myconius, O. Vita Huldrici Zwinglii ab Oswaldo Myconio conscripta. (The best edition is in Neander's Vitae Quatuor Reformatorum. Berlin. 1841.)

Salat, Johann. Chronik der schweizerischen Reformation von deren Anfängen bis A.D. 1534. In Archiv für schweizerische Reformationsgeschichte. Vol. I. Solothurn. 1868.

Sicher. Die Chronik Fridolin Sichers. Edited by E. Götzinger in the St Gallen Mitteil. zur vaterlandischen Geschichte xx. Neue Folge, x. St Gallen. 1885.

Tschudi, V. Chronik der Reformationsjahre 1521-1533, von I. Strickler. Separatausgabe (No. XXIV) des Glarner hist. Jahrbuchs. Bern. 1889. Also in Archiv für Schw. Gesch Vol. IX, pp. 322-447.

Wyss. Die Chronik des Bernhard Wyss, von Georg Finsler. Basel. 1901. In Quellen zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte unter Leitung von Dr E. Egli.

See also Verzeichnisse in the Index Volume (Vol. V, part 2) of Strickler's Actensammlung.

B. Documents.

General.

Egli, E. Actensammlung zur Geschichte der Zurcher Reformation, 1519-33. Zurich. 1879.

Fusslin, J. K. Beytrage zur Erlauterung der Kirchen Reformationsgeschichte des Schweizerlandes 5 parts Zurich. 1741-55. See especially the article on Conrad Hofmann.

Gisi, W. Actenstucke zur Schweizergeschichte der Jahre 1521-1522 (contains French documents). Archiv fur Schw. Gesch. Vol. XV, pp. 285-318.

Simler, J. J. Sammlung alter und neuer Urkunden zur Beleuch. der Kirchengeschichte, vornehmlich des Schweizerlandes 2 vols. Zurich. 1759-63.

Strickler, J. Eidgenoss. Abschiede. Vol. IV, I *a* (1521-28), Brugg, 1873 and I *b* (1529-33), Zurich, 1876.

—— Actensammlung zur schweizerischen Reformationsgeschichte in den Jahren 1521-32. 5 vols. Zurich 1877-1884.

C. Chronicles, Documents, etc.

Special points and subjects.

Bannwart, P. (edited by). Denkschrift der Priorin und Schwestern in St Catharinathal über ihre Erlebnisse wahrend der Reformationszeit. Archiv für schw. Ref. III, pp. 99-116

Basel. Chronik des Karthauser-Klosters in Klein-Basel, 1401-1532. In Basler Chroniken, vol. I (edited by W. Vischer und A. Stern). Leipzig. 1887.

Bernoulli, A. (edited by). Die Anonyme Chronik der Mailanderkriege (1507-16). In Basler Chroniken, vol VI, pp. 463 f. Leipzig. 1902.

Blösch, E. (edited by). Eine neue Quelle zur Gesch. der Berner Disput. In Theolog. Zeitschrift aus der Schweiz, 1891, pp. 157 ff.

Bucer, M. Historische Nachricht von dem Gespräch zu Marburg zwischen Luthern und Zwinglin. In Simler, Sammlung, etc. Vol II, part ii, pp. 471 sqq.

Collin, R. Summa colloquii Marpurgensis. In Hospinian, Historia Sacramentaria (*see below*, Theological section), or in Zwingli, Opera (edd. Schuler und Schulthess), IV, pp 173 ff.

Cysat, Renward. Luzern's Geheimbuch verfasst von Stadtschreiber R. Cysat. Edited by Scherer-Boccard. Archiv für schw. Ref. III, pp. 117-176.

Egli, E. Documente und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte Zwinglis und seiner Zeit. Printed in Analecta Reformatoria I, pp. 1-24. Zurich 1899.

—— On Zwingli's notes concerning the Bernese Disputation in Staatsarchiv, Zurich. Analecta Reformatoria I, pp. 37-44.

Faber, J. (Bishop). Report of the Disputation of Jan. 29, 1523 to the Innsbruck government. In Katholische Schweizerblätter, Series 11 (1895), No. II, pp. 183 ff. Edited by J. G. Mayer. Lucerne. 1895.

Gall-Morel, R P. Urkunden zur Geschichte Zwinglis aus dem Stiftsarchiv Einsiedeln. ASRG. I, pp. 787 ff.

Hedio. Reisebericht (to Marburg). Edited by Erichson in Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte, IV, pp. 420 ff.

Küssenberg, H. Chronik (for Baden, 1522 onwards). Edited by Huber in Archiv für schw. Ref. III, pp. 411 ff.

Landolt. Urkunden zur Reformationsgeschichte des Stadtchens Stein-am-Rhein, 1523–8. In Archiv fur schw. Ref. III, pp. 624–630.

Lavater. Verantwortung betreffend seinen Oberbefehl bei Kappel. Edited by Egli in Anal Reform. I, pp. 150–164.

Ryff, F. Chronik, 1514–41. In Basler Chroniken, vol. I, edited by Vischer und Stern. Leipzig. 1887.

Ryhiner, H. Chronik des Bauernkrieges, 1525. In Basler Chroniken, vol. VI, edited by A. Bernoulli, pp 463 ff. Leipzig. 1902

Scherer-Boccard. Acten zum Christlichen Bundniss zwischen Ferdinand und den V Orten (1525–29) Aus dem Luzerner Staatsarchiv. Archiv fur schw. Ref III, pp. 555–598

—— Preliminaracten zu einem Schutzbundniss zwischen Papst Clement VII, Kaiser Karl V, und den V Katholischen Orten. Archiv für schw. Ref. II, pp. 546–557.

—— 135 papstliche Schreiben an Tagsatzungen, Orte, etc., grossentheils aus dem XVI Jahrhundert. Archiv fur schw. Ref. II, pp. 1–97.

[*See also* Cysat]

Schirrmacher. Briefe und Acten zur Geschichte des Religionsgespräches zu Marburg 1523 und des Reichstages zu Augsburg 1530 nach den Handschriften des Joh. Aurifaber. Gotha. 1876.

D. Letters.

See also Finsler's Bibliographie, pp. 171–2; and Zwingli's Letters in vols VII and VIII of Opera

Arbenz, E Die Vadianische Briefsammlung In Mitt. zur vaterlandischen Geschichte XXIV, 4, pp. 80 ff, XXV, XXVII and XXVIII, pp. 1 ff. St Gallen. 1890

Egli, J. E. Unpublished letters from the Augsburg Reichstag (Aug. and Sept. 1530). In Analecta Reformatoria I, pp 45–60. Zurich. 1899.

Fechter Achtzehn ungedruckte Briefe von Ulrich Zwingli und Albertus Durerius an B. Rhenanus. In Archiv fur schw. Geschichte, vol X, pp 185 ff. Zurich. 1885.

Friedensburg, W. Beitrage zum Briefwechsel der katholischen Gelehrten Deutschlands im Reformationszeitalter. Zeitschr. fur Kirchengesch. Vol XX, pp. 59–95 and 242–259 for letters of Bishop Faber. 1899–1900.

Fusslin, J. K Epistolae ab Ecclesiae Helveticae reformatoribus vel ad eos scriptae. Zurich 1742

Herminjard, A. L. Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les pays de langue française (especially vol. II). 8 vols. Geneva, Basel, Lyons, Paris. 1866–93.

Lenz, M. Zwingli und Landgraf Philip. In Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. 1879, vol. III, pp 28 ff., 220 ff., 429 ff.

Liebenau, T. von. Briefe uber die Disputation in Baden. Aus dem Luzerner Staatsarchiv. Archiv fur schw. Ref. 1869, I, pp. 798 ff.

cherer-Boccard, T. von. Schreiben Franz I von Frankreich an Orte der Eidgenossenschaft. Aus dem Staatsarchiv von Luzern. Archiv für schw. Ref. III, pp. 631–640.

tähelin, R. Briefe aus der Reformationszeit. Basel. 1887.

roll, J. K. Three Letters to the Council at Winterthur. Printed in Neujahrsbl. v. d. Bürgerbibliothek zu Winterthur, XI 6, VI 1, V 16. Winterthur. 1844.

irck, H. and Winckelmann, O. Politische Correspondenz der Stadt Strassburg im Zeitalter der Reformation. Strassburg. I. 1882. II. 1887.

Vartmann, H. Fünf Briefe H. Zwinglis an Joachim von Watt aus dem Stadtarchiv von St Gallen. Mitteil. zur vaterländ. Geschichte III, pp. 210–216. 1866. St Gallen.

IV.

A. BIOGRAPHIES.

(*In order of importance.*)

Stähelin, R. Huldreich Zwingli. Sein Leben und Wirken nach den Quellen dargestellt. 2 vols. Basel. 1895–97.

Mörikofer, J. C. Ulrich Zwingli nach den urkundlichen Quellen. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1867–69.

Christoffel, R. Huldreich Zwingli, Leben und ausgewählte Schriften. Elberfeld. 1857. The biography translated into English by Cochran. Edinburgh. 1858.

Jackson, S. M. Huldreich Zwingli, 1484–1531. New York and London. 1901.

Also: Stahelin in Herzog-Plitt, Real-Encyclopadie: Hoff in Lichtenberger's Encyclopédie des Sciences religieuses, 1882, vol. XII, pp. 521 ff.: Egli in Allg Deutsche Biographie.

B. BIOGRAPHICAL STUDIES AND ARTICLES.

See also Finsler's Bibliographie, pp. 169–172.

Christen, E. Zwingli avant la Réforme de Zurich. Geneva. 1899.

Egli, E. Zwingli und die Ostschweizerischen Anhanger der Lutherischen Abendmahlslehre. In Anal. Reform. I, pp. 61 ff.

—— Zwingli und die Synoden, besonders in der Ost-Schweiz. In Anal. Reform. I, pp. 80 ff.

—— Zwinglis Stellung zum Kirchenbann und dessen Verteidigung durch die St Galler. In Anal. Reform. I, pp. 99 ff.

—— Zwingli in Wien. Theolog. Zeitschrift aus d. Schweiz. Zurich. Vol. I, 1884, p. 92.

—— Die Namensform Zwingling. Theolog. Zeitschrift aus d. Schweiz. Vol. I, 1884, p. 185.

Erichson, A. Zwinglis Tod und dessen Beurtheilung durch Zeitgenossen. Strassburg. 1883.

Ghinzoni. Ulrico Zwinglio e Francesco II Sforza. Boll. Stor. della Svizzera Italiana XV, 1893, pp. 9 ff. Bellinzona.

Heer, G. Zwingli als Pfarrer von Glarus Zurich. 1884.

Kind, Paul. Ulrich Zwingli und Franz II Sforza. Theolog. Zeitschrift aus d. Schweiz. 1896, pp. 131–9.

Nitz, C. A. Ulrich Zwingli. Gotha. 1884.

Odinger, Th. Ein Idyll Rudolf Gualter's uber Zwinglis Tod. Theolog. Zeitschrift aus d. Schweiz. 1891, pp. 54–59.

Oechsli, W. Zwingli als politischer Theoretiker. In Turicensia, pp. 87–113. Zurich. 1891.
Reber, B. Zwinglis politisches Wirken bis zur Schlacht von Pavia. Beiträge zur vaterland. Geschichte. Vol. v, 1854, pp. 245 ff.
Schweizer, A. Zwinglis Bedeutung neben Luther. Zurich. 1884.
Stahelin, R. Huldreich Zwingli und sein Reformationswerk. Halle. 1883.
—— Zwingli als Prediger. Theolog. Zeitscht. aus d. Schweiz. 1887, pp. 12 ff.
Steck, R. Zwingli in Basel Theolog. Zeitschrift aus d. Schweiz. Vol. I, 1884, pp. 185–187.
Usteri, L. Initia Zwinglii. Studien und Kritiken, Jahrg. 58, 1885, pp. 607–672 und Jahrg 59, 1886, pp. 95–159: also separately printed.
—— Zu Zwinglis Elenchus. Zeitschr. fur Kirchengesch. Vol. XI. 1889–90, pp. 161–165. (See also Baur, Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. X, 1889, pp. 330–344.)
Werder, J. Zwingli als politischer Reformator. Beitrage zur vaterländischen Geschichte, Neue Folge. Vol. I, pp. 263 ff. Basel. 1882.

For various details reference should be made to Zwingliana, Zurich, 1897 etc., ed. Egli.

C. HISTORIES.

a. General.

Beard, C. The Reformation of the 16th century in its relation to modern thought and knowledge. London. 1883.
Hagenbach, K. R. Kirchengeschichte von der altesten Zeit bis zum 19 Jahrhundert. Vol. III. Geschichte der Reformation vorzuglich in Deutschland und der Schweiz. 4th ed. Leipzig. 1870. Translated into English by Evelina Moore. 2 vols. Edinburgh. 1878–79.
Hergenrother, J. A. G. Concilien-Geschichte (Vol. IX of Hefele). Freiburg i. B. 1890.
Janssen, J. and Pastor, L. Geschichte des deutschen Volkes seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters. Freiburg i. B. 1899. Especially vol. III, pp. 92–264; also, An meine Kritiker (Freiburg i. B. 1891); and, Ein zweites Wort an meine Kritiker (Freiburg i B 1895).
Moller, W. and Kawerau, G. Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. Vol. III, Reformation und Gegenreformation. Freiburg i. B. and Leipzig. 1894. Translated into English by J. H. Freese. London and New York. 1900.
Ranke, L. v. Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation. Especially III, pp. 40–72, 232–269. Vol IV of Sämmtliche Werke Leipzig. 1874 etc
Schaff, P. History of the Christian Church. Modern Christianity. The German Reformation, A.D. 1517–1530 (Divisions I and II). Edinburgh. 1888.

b. Constitutional, Economic, etc.

Blumer, J. J. Rechtsgeschichte der Schweiz Demokratien. (For Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Glarus, Zug, and Appenzell.) Vol. I, to 1531. Vol. II, to 1798. St Gallen. 1850 and 1858.
Bluntschli, J. C. Geschichte des Schweizerischen Bundesrechtes von dem ersten ewigen Bunde bis auf die Gegenwart. Vol. I, to p. 343. Vol. II, documents, to page 276 Stuttgart. 1875.
Dändliker, K. Die Berichterstattungen und Anfragen der Zürcher Regierung an die Landschaft in der Zeit vor der Reformation. Jahrbuch für schw. Gesch. Vol. XXI, pp. 38–70.
—— Zürcher Volksanfragen von 1521 bis 1798. Jahrbuch für schw. Gesch. Vol. XXIII, pp. 147 f.

Dubs, A. Das öffentliche Recht der Schweiz. Eidgenossenschaft. I, II. 2nd edition. Zurich. 1878.
Erhardt. Die national-ökonomischen Ansichten der Reformatoren. Zweiter Art. Huldreich Zwingli. Theolog. Stud. u. Kritik. 1881, I, pp. 106 ff.
Fechter, D. A. Basels Anstalten zur Unterstützung der Armen und Kranken während des Mittelalters. Beiträge zur vat. Geschichte, IV, 185.
Moses. Federal Government of Switzerland. Oakland, California. 1889.
Riggenbach. Das Armenwesen der Reformation. Basel. 1883.
Strickler, J. Grundzinse, Frohndienste und Zehnten, oder Bilder aus der Geschichte des bäuerlichen Grundebesitzes. Zeitschr. f. Schweiz. Statistik. 1874. 2.
Vincent, J. M. Government in Switzerland. New York and London. 1900

c. LOCAL, ETC.

Baden, R. Die Reformation und ihr Einfluss auf das Zürcherische Recht. Theolog. Zeitschrift aus d. Schweiz. 1902 (I), pp 9–20.
Baur, A. Zur Vorgeschichte der Disputation von Baden Zeitschr für Kirchengesch. Vol. XXI, pp. 91–111. 1900–1.
Blosch, E. Der Kardinal Schinner. Akademischer Vortrag. 1890.
—— Geschichte der schweizerisch-reformierten Kirchen. Vols. I and II. Bern. 1899.
—— Die Vorreformation in Bern. Jahrbuch für schw. Gesch. Vol IX. 1884.
Brieger. Ueber einen angeblich neuen Bericht uber das Marburger Religionsgespräch. In Zeitschr. fur Kirchengesch. I, pp. 628–638
Büchtold, J. Hans Salat. Sein Leben und seine Schriften. Basel 1876.
—— Nicklaus Manuel. In vol. II of the Bibliothek alterer Schriftwerke der deutschen Schweiz und ihrer Grenzgebiete. Frauenfeld. 1876.
Camenisch, C. Carlo Borromeo und die Gegenreformation im Veltlin. Chur. 1901.
Clemen, O. Hinne Rode Zeitschr. fur Kirchengesch. Vol. XVIII, pp. 346–372 and note 639–640. 1897–8.
Coolidge, W. A. B. The Republic of Gersau. English Hist Review IV, pp. 481 f.
Dändliker, K. Komtur Schmidt von Kussnacht. In Züricher Taschenbuch. 1897.
—— Geschichte der Schweiz. 3 vols. Zurich. 1884.
—— A short history of Switzerland, translated by Salisbury. London. 1899.
Dierauer, J. Geschichte der schweizerischen Eidgenossenschaft. Vol II, to 1510. Gotha. 1892.
Egli, E Zürcherische Kirchenpolitik von Waldmann bis Zwingli. Jahrbuch für schw. Gesch. Vol. XXI, pp. 1–34.
—— Die Zuricher Widertaufer zur Reformationszeit. Zurich 1878.
—— Die Schlacht von Cappel, 1531. Mit zwei Planen und einem Anhange ungedruckter Quellen. Zurich. 1873.
—— Das Religionsprach zu Marburg. Theolog. Zeitschrift aus der Schweiz. Vol. I, 1884, pp. 5–30. Zurich.
Ernest, Ulrich. Geschichte des Zürchischen Schulwesens bis gegen Ende des 16 Jahrhunderts. Zurich. 1879.
Escher, H. Die Glaubensparteien in der Eidgenossenschaft und ihre Beziehungen zum Ausland: vornehmlich zum Hause Habsburg und zu den deutschen Protestanten. Frauenfeld. 1882. [Of first-rate importance.]
—— Die Verhältnisse der freien Gotteshausleute. Archiv f. sch. Geschichta. Vol. VI, pp. 3–29. 1849. Zurich.
Fiali. Reformation und Gegenreformation in den freien Amteien. Archiv für schw. Ref. pp. 529 ff.
Gisi, W. Antheil der Eidgenossen an der europäischen Politik in den Jahren 1512 bis 1516. Schaffhausen. 1866.

Gisi, W. Der Antheil der Eidgenossen an der europäischen Politik während der Jahre 1517 bis 1521. Archiv f. sch. Geschichte. Vol. xvii, pp. 63–132. 1871. Zurich.
Götzinger, E. Zwei Kalender vom Jahre 1527. Schaffhausen. 1865.
Grüneisen, E. Nicklaus Manuel Stuttgart. 1837.
Herzog, J. J. Christoph von Uttenheim, Bischof von Basel zur Zeit der Reformation. Beitrage. Vol. i. 1839, pp. 33–93 (with note on p. 305). Basel.
Hidber, B. Renward Cysat, der Stadtschreiber zu Luzern. Archiv f. schw. Geschichte. Vol. xiii, pp. 161–224 and xx, pp. 3–88.
Horawitz, A. Johann Heigerlin (gen Faber), Bischof von Wien. Vienna. 1884.
Huber, A. Die Waldstatte bis zur festen Begrundung ihrer Eidgenossenschaft. Innsbruck. 1861.
Hyrvoix. François I^er et la première guerre de religion en Suisse 1529–1531, d'après la correspondance diplomatique. In Revue des Questions historiques, April, 1902, pp. 465–537.
Jecklin, F Blaurock. In Jahresbericht xxi der histor.-antiq.-Gesellschaft von Graubunden 1891. pp. 1 f.
Kawerau, W. Thomas Murner und die deutsche Reformation. Halle. 1891.
Kesselring. Interpolirte Zwingli Briefe. Theolog. Zeitschrift aus d. Schweiz. Vol i. 1884 Zurich.
Kluckhohn. Urkundliche Beiträge zur Geschichte der kirchlichen Zustände; insbesondere des sittlichen Lebens der katholischen Geistliche in der Diocese Konstanz wahrend des xvi Jahrhunderts. Zeitschr. für Kirch. Vol. xvi, 1896–7, pp 590–625.
Lichtenhahn, K. Die Secularisation der Kloster und Stifte Basels. Beitrage. Vol. i. pp. 94–109.
Loserth. Die Stadt Waldshut und die vorder-osterr. Regierung, 1523–1526. In Arch f. ost Ges. 77, pp. 1 ff
Lüthi, E Die Bernische Politik in den Kappelerkriegen. Bern. 1880.
Marmor, W. Die Beziehungen der Stadt Constanz zu der Eidgenossenschaft wahrend des Mittelalters, 1259–1520 Archiv f. schw. Geschichte. Vol. xviii, pp 111–189. 1873. Zurich.
Mayer, J G. Das Konzil von Trient und die Gegenreformation in der Schweiz. Vol i Stanz. 1901
—— Das Stift Rheinau und die Reformation Jahrbuch für schw. Gesch. Vol xxvi, pp. 295–312.
Meyer von Knonau. Aus der schweiz. Geschichte in der Zeit der Reformation und Gegenreformation. Die Eidgenossenschaft gegenuber dem deutschen Bauernkrieg von 1526. Hist. Zeitschrift, 1878, i.
Meyer, D Die Reformation der deutschen Schweiz im Gewande der dramatischen Dichtung Theolog. Zeitschrift aus d. Schweiz. 1892, pp. 121–128 and 163–176.
Mezger, J. J. Geschichte der deutschen Bibelubersetzungen in der schw. reform Kirche. Basel 1876
Nitsche, R. Geschichte der Wiedertaufer in der Schweiz zur Reformationszeit. Einsiedeln. 1885.
Oechsli, W. Zwingli als politischer Theoretiker. In Turicensia, pp. 87–113. Zurich. 1891.
—— Das eidgenoss Glaubensconcordat von 1525. Jb. f Sch. Ges. xiv, pp. 263ff.
—— Die Anfange des Glaubens-konfliktes zwischen Zurich und den Eidgenossen 1521–1524. Winterthur. 1883.
Oper, L. Die Stadt Basel und ihr Bischof. Beitrage. Vol. iv (1850), pp. 229 ff.
Pastor, L Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen wahrend der Regierung Karl's V. aus den Quellen dargestellt. Freiburg i. B. 1879.

Pestalozzi, C. Heinrich Bullinger. Leben und ausgewählte Schriften. Elberfeld. 1858.

Riggenbach, E. J. Der Kirchengesang in Basel seit der Reformation. In Beiträge, vol. IX (1870), Basel, p. 327 ff. Also note on same in vol. X (1875), p. 365.

Rilliet, A. Les Origines de la Confédération Suisse. Histoire et Légende. Geneva. 1869.

Rockholz, E. L. Tel und Gessler. Heilbronn. 1877.

Rohrer, F. Das christliche Bürgerrecht. Lucerne. 1876.

—— Das sogenannte Waldmannische Concordat Jahrbuch f. Schw. Geschichte. Vol. IV, pp. 1 ff. 1879 (with criticism by Stähelin, Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch. 1884, pp 429 ff.).

Rott, E. Histoire de la representation diplomatique de la France auprès des cantons suisses, de leurs alliés, et de leurs confédérés. 2 vols. Vol. I (1430–1559). Bern 1900.

Ruchat, A. Histoire de la Réformation de la Suisse, edited by Vulliemin. 7 vols Paris and Lausanne. 1835–8.

Salzberger, G. Beitrage zur Toggenburgischen evangelischen Kirchengeschichte. Mitteil. zur vaterlandische Geschichte. III, pp 16 ff. 1866. St Gallen.

Sarasin, A. Versuch einer Geschichte des Basler Munsters. In Beiträge, vol. I (1839), pp. 1–32.

Schaffroth, J. G. Der Reformator Niklaus Manuel von Bern. Basel. 1885.

Schiss. Die Beziehungen Graubundens zur Eidgenossenschaft besonders zu Zurich im XVI Jahrhundert. Jahrbuch fur schw. Gesch. Vol. XXVII, pp. 29 f.

Schreiber, H. Heinrich Loriti Glareanus. Freiburg. 1837.

Schultz, Emil. Reformation und Gegenreformation in den freien Aemtern. Basel. 1899.

Schweizer, P. Die Behandlung der Zurcherischen Klostergüter in d. Reformationszeit. In Theolog. Zeitschrift aus der Schw. (ed. Meili). Vol. II (1885), pp. 161 ff Zurich.

Seitz, O. Die Stellung des Urbanus Rhegius im Abendmahlsstreite. ZKG. Vol. XIX, pp. 293–329. 1898–9.

Stahelin, R. Die reformatorische Wirksamkeit......Vadians. Beitrage, Neue Folge, I (1882), pp. 191–262.

Stehlin, K. Ueber die diplomatischen Verbindungen Englands mit der Schweiz im 16 und 17 Jahrhundert. Beitrage. Vol. VII (1860), pp. 45 f.

Vetter, F. Die Reformation von Stadt und Kloster Stein-am-Rhein. Jahrbuch für schw. Gesch. Vol. IX, 1884, pp 213–261.

Vischer, W. Die Sage von der Befreiung der Waldstatte. Leipzig. 1867.

Vogelin, S. Das alte Zurich. Zurich. 1878.

Vuilleumier, H. V. L'Église du pays de Vaud au temps de la Réformation. Lausanne. 1902.

Vulliemin, L. Histoire de la Confédération Suisse. 2 vols. Lausanne. 1879.

Waldburger, A. Rheinau und die Reformation. Jahrbuch fur schw. Gesch Vol. XXV, pp. 81–362.

Weber, H. Geschichte des Kirchengesangs in der deutschen reformirten Schweiz seit der Reformation. Zurich. 1878.

Wyss, G. von. Ueber d. Geschichte d. drei Lande, 1215–1301. Zurich. 1858.

d. THEOLOGICAL.

[*See also* Stähelin, Christoffel and Morikofer in Biographies; *also* Corpus Reformatorum, Breitschneider, vol. XXVI.]

Baur, Aug. Zwinglis Theologie, ihr Werden und ihr System. 2 vols. Halle 1885–89.

Daniel, H. A. Codex Liturgicus (especially vol. III). 4 vols. Leipzig. 1847–53.

Dieckhoff, A. W. Die Evangelische Abendmahlslehre im Reformationszeitalter. I [all that has appeared]. Gottingen. 1854.

Dilthey, W. In Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie, vol. v, 1892, pp. 367 ff.: vol. vi, 1893, pp. 119 ff., pp. 523 ff

—— Die Glaubenslehre der Reformatoren. In Preuss. Jahrbücher, 1894, I, 70.

Engelhardt, E. Die innere Genesis und der Zusammenhang der Marburger, Schwabacher und Torgauer Artikel, sowie der Augsburger Confession. In Zeitschrift fur hist Theologie, 1865, pp. 519–529

Frank, F. H. R. Die Theologie der Concordienformel. 4 vols. Erlangen. 1858–65.

Gottschick, J. Hus', Luther's und Zwingli's Lehre von der Kirche. Zeitschr. für Kirchengesch VIII (1886–7), pp. 345–394 and 543–616.

Harnack, A Dogmengeschichte, Part II, Bk III, Chap IV. In English Translation: vol VI, pp 168 ff. London. 1899.

Heitz Ueber den Taufritus der reformirten Kirche der Schweiz. Theolog. Zeitschrift aus d. Schweiz. Vol. III. 1886, pp 158–167

Hospinianus, R. Historia Sacramentaria. 2 vols. Geneva. 1681. (Vol. II, De origine et progressu controversiae sacramentariae, reaches to 1612)

Hundeshagen, K. B. Die Konflikte des Zwinglianismus, Lutherthums und Calvinismus in den Bernischen Landkirchen, 1522–1558, nach meist ungedruckten Quellen dargestellt. Bern. 1842.

—— Beiträge zur Kirchenverfassungsgeschichte und Kirchenpolitik, insbesondere des Protestantismus Wiesbaden. Vol I. 1864.

Kugelgen, E. W. von. Die Ethik Huldreich Zwinglis. Leipzig. 1902.

Loofs, F. Leitfaden zum Studium der Dogmengeschichte. 3rd ed. Halle. 1893.

Löscher, V. E. Historia Motuum (between Lutherans and Reformed). 1st edition, 1723–24; 2nd edition, by J. R Kiesling. Leipzig and Schwabach. 1770.

Müller, E F. K. Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche—in authentischen Texten, pp. 1–100. Leipzig. 1903.

Niemeyer, H. A. Collectio Confessionum in ecclesiis reformatis publicatarum. Leipzig. 1840.

Richter, Aem. L. Die evangelischen Kirchenordnungen des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts. Urkunden und Regesten zur Geschichte des Rechts und der Verfassung der evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland, pp. 21 ff. and 134 ff. 2 vols. Weimar. 1846.

Richter, L. Geschichte der evangelischen Kirchenverfassung in Deutschland (pp. 148–166) Leipzig. 1851.

Schaff, Ph. Bibliotheca Symbolica. New York 1877.

Schmid, H. Der Kampf der Lutherischen Kirche um Luthers Lehre vom Abendmahl im Reformationszeitalter. Leipzig. 1868.

Schweizer, A. Die protestantischen Centraldogmen in ihrer Entwicklung innerhalb der reformierten Kirche. Zurich. 1854–6.

Sigwart, C. Ul. Zwingli, der Charakter seiner Theologie mit besonderer Rucksicht auf Picus von Mirandola. Stuttgart and Hamburg. 1855.

Stahl, F. J. Die Lutherische Kirche und die Union. Berlin. 1860.

Thomasius-Seeberg. Dogmengeschichte des Mittelalters und der Neuzeit. Vol. II, pp. 395–421 and 520–637. Erlangen and Leipzig. 1889.

(*See also Bibliographies to Chapters V—VIII, and to Chapter XI.*)

CHAPTER XI.

CALVIN.

I. BIBLIOGRAPHIES.

Catalogus operum Calvini. Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia. Vol. LIX, pp 462–512.

Catalogus operum quae sunt de Calvino. Ioannis Calvini Opera quae supersunt omnia. Vol. LIX, pp. 517–586

Haag, Eug. et Em. La France protestante ... Tome III, pp. 143–162. Paris. 1852.

Herzog-Plitt, J. J. Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche. Vol. III, pp. 77–79. Leipzig. 1878. Ibid. 3rd ed., edited by Hauck. Vol. III, pp. 654, 655. Leipzig. 1897.

Rilliet, A. Bibliographie de la vie de Calvin. Paris. 1864.

Schaff, Ph. History of the Christian Church, vol. VII, pp. 223–231. New York. 1892. Edinburgh. 1893.

Senebier, J. Auteurs à consulter sur la vie de Calvin. Histoire littéraire de Genève, pp. 260–265. Geneva. 1786

II. ORIGINAL AUTHORITIES.

Calvini, Ioannis, Opera quae supersunt omnia. LIX vols. Corpus Reformatorum. Vols. XXIX—LXXXVII. Brunswick and Berlin. 1869–97.

Works of Calvin published by the Calvin Translation Society. Edinburgh. 1843–55.

Bonnet, J. Lettres françaises de Jean Calvin. 2 vols. Paris. 1854. Translation: Letters of John Calvin. I, II, by Constable. Edinburgh. 1855. III, IV, by Gilchrist. Philadelphia. 1858.

Herminjard, A.-L. Correspondance des Réformateurs dans les pays de langue française. 9 vols. Basel, Geneva, Lyons. 1866–97.

III. BIOGRAPHIES.

A. General.

Adam, Melchior. Vita Calvini. In Vitae theologorum, pp. 63–113. Frankfort. 1618.

Alexander, W. Lindsay. Calvin. Encyclopaedia Britannica, edd. VIII and IX.

Audin, V. Histoire de la vie, des ouvrages et des doctrines de Calvin. 1st ed. Paris. 1841. Later ed. 1873. Translation: Gill, Life of Calvin. London. 1850.

Bayle, P. Calvin. Dictionnaire historique et critique. Vol. I. Rotterdam. 1696.

Beza, Th. Vita Calvini. Corpus Reformatorum, XLIX. 1879. Translation: Beveridge, Calvin's Tracts, vol. I. Transl. Soc. Edinburgh, 1844.

Bèze, Th. de. Discours contenant en brief l'histoire et mort de Maistre Jean Calvin. Geneva. 1564. And in the Corpus Reform., *ut supra.*

Bungener, F. Calvin, sa vie, son œuvre, et ses écrits. Paris. 1862–3. Translated into English, German, and Dutch in 1863, and in 1877 into Danish.

Dardier, Ch. Calvin le réformateur. Encyclopédie des sciences religieuses, II, 529–545. Paris. 1877.

Diehl, K. v. J. Kalvin, Teolog i Reformator (Zwiastun Ewangeliczny). Warsaw. 1864–5.

Doumergue, E. Jean Calvin. Les hommes et les choses de son temps. Lausanne. Vol I, La jeunesse 1899. Vol II, Les premiers Essais. 1902. [This work is still incomplete; vol. II ends with Calvin's return to Geneva.]

Dyer, T. H The life of John Calvin London. 1849.

Funk. Calvin. Wetzer und Welte: Kirchenlexikon, II, 1728–44. Freiburg, 1883.

Goguel, G. Le reformateur de la France et de Genève, Jean Calvin. Toul. 1863.

Guizot, F. P. G La vie de quatre grands chrétiens: Calvin, pp. 149–376. Paris. 1873 Translation: London 1881.

Haag, E. Vie de Calvin, à l'usage des écoles protestantes. Paris. 1840.

Haag, E C. La France protestante, III, 109–162 Paris. 1852.

Henry, P. Das Leben Calvin's. 3 vols. Hamburg. 1835–44. Translation: Stebbing, Life and Times of Calvin. 2 vols London. 1849.

Herzog, J. J Calvin. Realencyklopadie fur prot. Theologie und Kirche. Leipzig. 1st ed. 1854, 2nd ed. 1878.

Mackenzie, J. Memoirs of the life and writings of John Calvin. London. 1818.

Stahelin, E. Calvin's Leben und ausgewahlte Schriften Elberfeld. 1863.

Stahelin, R Calvin.* Realencyklopadie fur prot. Theologie und Kirche, III, 654–683. 3rd ed. Leipzig. 1897.

B. Special Periods.

1. *Youth and Conversion.*

Couard-Lys, E. Documents inédits relatifs à Calvin Bull. du comité des travaux historiques et scientifiques, Section d'hist. et de philologie, pp. 7–13. Paris. 1884.

Dalton, H. Calvins Bekehrung. Deutsche evang. Blatter. Halle 1893.

Desmay, J. Remarques sur la vie de Jean Calvin, hérésiarque, tirées des Registres de Noyon. Rouen. 1621–57. Archives curieuses de l'histoire de France, V, pp. 387–398. Paris. 1835.

Lang, A. Die Bekehrung Johannes Calvins. Studien zur Geschichte der Theologie und Kirche. Vol. II. Part I Leipzig. 1897.

Lecoultre, H. La conversion de Calvin. Rev. de théol. et de philosophie, pp. 5–30. Lausanne. 1890.

Lefranc, A. La Jeunesse de Calvin. Paris. 1888.

Levasseur, J. Annales de l'église cathédrale de Noyon. Paris. 1633.

2. *Calvin in Geneva.*

Bolsec, Hier. Histoire de la Vie, Mœurs, Actes, Constance et Mort de Jean Calvin jadis ministre de Genève. Lyons. 1577. A Latin version was published at Cologne, 1580. The book has often been republished [though its animus is too marked to allow of its being trusted]; a later edition with introduction and notes is by L. F. Chastel. Lyons. 1875.

Cornelius, C. V. Historische Arbeiten, vornehmlich zur Reformationszeit. Leipzig. 1899.
Galiffe, J. A. Matériaux pour l'histoire de Genève. 2 vols. Geneva. 1829.
Kampschulte, F. W. Johann Calvin, seine Kirche und sein Staat in Genf. Vol. I. 1869. Vol. II. Leipzig. 1899.
Pierson, A. Studiën over J. K. Amsterdam. 1881. (De Omwenteling te Genève voor K., pp. 17-57. K.'s Geloofsverandering, pp. 58-109. K. in de eerste helft van 1536, pp. 243-256.) Nieuwe Studien. Amsterdam. 1883. Kalvin en Caroli, pp. 17-89. Kalvin's Nederlaag in 1538, pp. 90-149.
—— Studien over J. K. 1540-2. Ser. III. Amsterdam. 1891. (K. naar Genève Teruggeroepen, pp. 1-42. K. en de troebelen te Neuchâtel, pp. 43-83. De eerste maanden te Genève, pp. 84-122. Caroli naar de Nederlaag, pp. 123-184.)
Roget, A. Histoire du peuple de Genève depuis la Réforme jusqu'à l'Escalade. Geneva. 1870-83.

3. *Death.*

F. V. La Mort de Calvin. La Croix. Paris. 1864.
Zahn, A. Die beiden letzten Lebensjahre von Calvin. Leipzig. 1895.

4. *Private life*

Bonnet, J. Idelette de Bure. Bull. 1856, pp. 638-646. Étrennes chrétiennes. Geneva, 1857, pp. 104-123. Récits du 16e siècle, Paris, 1864, pp. 75-100.
—— Les amitiés de Calvin Bull. 1864, pp. 89-96.—Ibid. 1869, pp. 257-268, 449-462. Récits du 16e siècle, Paris, 1864, pp. 101-175, 319-352.
Gaberel, J. La vie intime de Calvin. Souvenirs religieux, pp. 273-293. Toul. 1865.
Galiffe, J. A. Notices généalogiques sur les familles Génevoises. Pp. 106-113. Geneva. 1836
Hausrath, A. Calvins Verheirathung. Leipzig. 1883.
Lang, A Das hausliche Leben Johann Calvins. Beilage zur Allg. Zeitung, nos. 137, 138, 140, 142. Munich. 1893.
Ollier, D. Le mariage de Calvin. Rev. chrétienne, 1892, II, pp. 210-226.

C. Thought and Theology.

Baur, F. C. Christliche Dogmengeschichte. Vol. III. Leipzig. 1867.
—— Die christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung Gottes.... Vol. III. Tubingen. 1843.
Bonnet, J. Le traité De Clementia. Rev. chrét. 1857, pp. 219-22.
Cunningham, W The reformers and the theology of the reformation, pp. 292-525. Edinburgh 1862.
Gass, W. Geschichte der prot. Dogmatik, I. Pp. 99-124. 1854.
Kostlin, J. Calvins Institutio nach Form und Inhalt in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung. Studien und Kritiken, pp. 7-62, 410-486. Gotha. 1868.
Lecoultre, H. Calvin d'après son commentaire sur le De Clementia. Rev. de théol. et de phil., pp. 51-77. Lausanne 1891.
Loofs, Friedrich. Die lehrhafte Auffassung des evangelischen Christentums durch Calvin. Dogmengeschichte, pp 390-401.
Rilliet, A. Introduction hist. au Catéchisme et à la confession de fois, 1537. Le premier catéchisme de Calvin, I-XCVIII. Paris. 1878.
Rougemont, H. de. L'Inst. chrét. de Calvin dans sa rédaction primitive. Le Chrétien évangélique, pp. 77-83. Lausanne. 1886.

Schneckenburger, M. Vergleichende Vorstellung des lutherischen und ref. Lehrbegriffs. 2 vols. Stuttgart. 1855.

Schweizer, A. Die prot. Centraldogmen in ihrer Entwicklung innerhalb der ref. Kirche. I, pp. 150–249 *et passim*. Zurich. 1854.

IV. HISTORY OF THE SIXTEENTH CENTURY IN RELATION TO CALVIN.

Baird, H. M. History of the rise of the Huguenots. 2 vols. London. 1880.

Bez, G. Les luttes religieuses en France et Calvin d'après sa correspondance. Toul 1887.

Histoire Ecclésiastique des Églises Réformées au Royaume de France. 1580. Later ed, by Baum and Cunitz. 3 vols 1883–9.

Merle d'Aubigne, J. H. Histoire de la réformation en Europe au temps de Calvin. Paris. 1863–78. Translation History of the Reformation in Europe in the time of Calvin. London. 1863–

Polenz, C. von. Geschichte des franzosischen Calvinismus. Gotha. I. 1857. II. 1859.

Puaux, F. Histoire de la réformation française Paris. 1857–9.

See also previous section (Biographies, General).

V. CALVIN AND HERESY.

Brunnemann, K. M. Servetus. Eine aktenmassige Darstellung des 1553 in Genf gegen ihn gefuhrten Criminalprozesses Berlin. 1865.

Buisson, F. Sébastien Castellion, sa vie et son œuvre. 2 vols. Paris. 1892.

Cologny, L. L'antitrinitairisme à Genève Geneva 1873

Dardier, C Michel Servet d'apres ses plus recents biographes. Revue historique. XI. Paris. 1879.

Florimond de Raemond. L'histoire de la naissance, progrez et décadence de l'hérésie Paris. 1605

Rilliet, A. Relation du procès criminel intenté à Genève en 1553 contre Servet. Mém. et documents de la société d'histoire et d'archéologie de Genève, pp. 1–160 Geneva 1844.

Tollin, H. Charakterbild M. Servets. Berlin. 1876.

—— Servet uber Predigt, Taufe und Abendmahl. Theologische Studien und Kritiken Gotha. 1881.

Willis, R. Servetus and Calvin. London. 1877.

VI. CALVIN AS EDUCATOR.

Borgeaud, Ch. Calvin Fondateur de l'Académie de Genève. Paris. 1897.

Damagnez, A. Influence de Calvin sur l'instruction. Montauban. 1886. This is a very meritorious example of the *theses* published at Montauban. Those dealing with Calvin are an immense multitude, and may be said to cover the whole field of his thought and activity.

Heiz, J. Calvin's Thatigkeit fur die Schule. Zeitschrift fur praktische Theol. Frankfort. 1889.

Schenck, J. C. Johann Calvin's Verdienste auf dem Gebiete der Erziehung und des Unterrichts. Frankfort. 1863.

VII. CALVIN AS STATESMAN.

Biesterveld, P. Calvin gewaardeerd in zijne politieke beginselen. Tijdschrift voor geref. Theol. Kampen, 1900, pp. 272–276.

Choisy, E. La théocratie à Genève au temps de Calvin. Geneva. 1897.

Hundeshagen, K. B. Ueber den Einfluss des Calvinismus auf die Idee vom Staat und staatsburgerlicher Freiheit. Bern. 1842.

Merle d'Aubigné. Jean Calvin, un des fondateurs des libertés modernes. Paris. 1868.

Tissot, F. Les relations entre l'Église et l'État à Genève au temps de Calvin. Lausanne. 1874.

Weber, G. Geschichtliche Darstellung des Calvinismus im Verhältniss zum Staat in Genf und Frankreich. Heidelberg. 1836

VIII. COMPARATIVE ESTIMATES.

Beard, C. The Reformation of the 16th century. London. 1883.

Gaberel, J. Calvin et Rousseau. Geneva. 1878.

Viguet, C. O. Étude sur le caractère distinctif de Calvin. Geneva. 1864.

IX. GENERAL CHURCH HISTORY.

Baur, F. C. Geschichte der christlichen Kirche. Vol. IV. Tübingen. 1863.

Fisher, G. P. The Reformation. London. 1873.

Gieseler, J. C. L. Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte Bonn. 1855.

Hardwick, C. A history of the Christian Church during the Reformation. London. 1873.

Hase, K. A. Kirchengeschichte. Leipzig. 1886.

Häusser, L. The period of the Reformation. 2 vols. London. 1873.

Kurtz, J. H. Church History. Transl. by J. Macpherson Vol. II. London. 1890.

Möller, W. Kirchengeschichte. Vol. III. Freiburg i B. 1894.

Rothe, Richard. Kirchengeschichte Heidelberg. 1875.

X. CALVIN AND FRENCH LITERATURE.

Gérusez, E. Histoire de la littérature française. Paris. 1872.

—— Histoire de l'éloquence politique et religieuse en France, pp. 192–285. 1837.

Nisard, D. Histoire de la littérature française. Paris. 1844.

Petit de Julleville, L. Histoire de la langue et de la littérature française (pp. 319–354, Théologiens et prédicateurs). Paris. 1897.

Sayous, A. Études littéraires sur les écrivains français de la Réformation. Paris. 1841.

CHAPTER XII.

THE CATHOLIC SOUTH.

MANUSCRIPTS.

Pietro Speziali de Gratia Dei is still in MS. in the St Mark's Library at Venice.

Many letters and papers of Renée are in the Turin archives, at Rome, Florence, and Modena.

Carnesecchi's process is in the Archives of Trinity College, Dublin, and Caracciolo's Life of Pius IV in many transcripts, at Rome (Barberini), Naples, and London (Brit. Mus. Harl.)

The process of Carranza is in the Library of the Real Academia de la Historia at Madrid.

The documents of the Inquisition at Udine, Modena, Naples, Palermo and elsewhere have not yet been entirely used for historical purposes.

PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS.

Artigny, A. G. de Nouveaux Mémoires d'histoire. Paris. 1749. Vol. II. [The process against Serveto at Vienne.]

Beccadelli, L. Monumenti. Ed. G. Morandi. 3 vols Bologna. 1797, 1799, 1804.

Bembo, P. (Card.) Opere. Ed. Morelli. 12 vols. Milan. 1808–10.

Biblioteca della Riforma Italiana. 1883 f.

Boehmer, E. Epistolae quaedam Joannis Sturmii et Hispanorum qui Argentorati degerunt. 1872.

Cabré, A. Cartas de San Ignacio de Loyola. Madrid. 1874, etc.

Caracciolo, A. De vita Pauli IV collectanea historica. Cologne. 1612.

Castelvetro, L. Opere, colla vita dell' autore scritta dal L. A. Muratori. Bern. 1727.

Contarini, G. Regesten u. Briefe des Cardinals C. Ed. F. Dittrich. Braunsberg. 1881.

—— Opera Paris 1571

Crespin, J. Histoire des Martyrs persécutés et mis à mort pour la vérité de l'Évangile. 1585. New edition. Toulouse. 1885.

Documentos ineditos para la historia de España. Vols. v, x, xi, xl, lxviii. 1842, etc.

Doellinger, I. von. Beitrage zur Geschichte. Vol. I. Ratisbon. 1862.

Enzinas, F. de (Dryander) Epistolae quinquaginta. In Kahnis's Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie, 1870, pp. 387 ff. Leipzig.

—— Mémoires. Ed. Campan. 2 vols. Brussels. 1862–3. German translation with notes by E Boehmer Bonn. 1893.

Fazy, H. Procès de Valentin Gentilis et de Nicolas Gallo. In Mémoires de l'Institut national Génevois. Vol XIV Geneva. 1878.

Ferrero, E. and Muller, G. Carteggio di Vittoria Colonna. Turin. 1889.

Fontana, B. Documenti Vaticani contro l' eresia luterana in Italia. Archivio della R. Soc. Rom. di Storia Patria. Vol. xv. Rome. 1892.
Friedensburg, W. Nuntiaturen des Vergerio. Gotha. 1892.
—— Nuntiaturen des Morone. Gotha. 1892.
Frizzi, A. Memorie per la storia di Ferrara. Ed. Laderchi. Vol. iv. Ferrara. 1848.
Galiffe, J. B. G. Le Réfuge italien de Genève aux xvi^e et xvii^e Siècles. 1881.
Gar, T. Relazioni della Corte di Roma. E. Albèri, Relazioni degli ambasciatori Veneti, Ser. ii, vols. iii, iv. Florence. 1846, 1857.
Gibbings, R. Trial and Martyrdom of P. Carnesecchi. Dublin. 1856.
—— The Roman Index Expurgatorius. Dublin. 1837.
Graziani, A. M. Vita Commendoni Cardinalis. Paris. 1669.
Henriques, G. J. C. [W. J. C. Henry]. Ineditos Goesianos. Vol. ii. (O processo na Inquisição.) Lisbon. 1899.
Herminjard, A. L. Correspondance des Réformateurs. Esp. vols. iv, vii. Geneva. 1878, 1886.
Kausler, E. and Schott, T. Briefwechsel zwischen Chr. Herzog von Württemberg und P. P. Vergerius. Stuttgart. 1875.
Laemmer, H. Monumenta Vaticana. Freiburg in Breisgau. 1861.
Leva, G. de. Eretici di Cittadella. Atti dell' Instituto Veneto, pp. 679–772. Venice. 1872–3.
Loaysa, G. de. Briefe an Kaiser Karl V. Ed. G. Heine. [Spanish text and German translation published separately.] Berlin. 1848.
Miscellanea di Storia Italiana. Vols. vi, x, xv 1869, etc.
Noltenius, G. L. Vita Olympiae Moratae. Ed J. G. V. Hesse. Frankfort on the Oder. 1775.
Paleario, A. Opera. Ed. F. A. Hallbauer. Jena. 1728.
Pastor, L. Correspondenz des Cardinals Contarini. In Historisches Jahrbuch i. 1880.
Philip II. Correspondance sur les affaires des Pays Bas. Ed. L. P. Gachard Vols. i, ii. Brussels. 1848.
Pole, R. (Card.). Epistolae. Ed. A. M. Quirini. 5 vols. Brescia. 1744–45–48–52.
Rebello da Silva, L. A. Corpo Diplomatico Portuguez. Vols. ii–v. Lisbon. 1865–68–70–74.
Reformistas antiguos españoles. 20 vols. (A description by Wilkens in Brieger's Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte ix 341. Gotha. 1847–80.)
Reusch, F. H. Die Indices librorum prohibitorum des sechszehnten Jahrhunderts. Stuttgart. 1887.
Reyna, Cassiodoro de. Epistolae xiii Ed. Boehmer. In Kahnis, Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie xl, 285 ff Leipzig.
Ribadeneira, P. de. Vida del P. Ignacio de Loyola, etc. Madrid. 1594.
Rilliet, J. H. A. Relation du procès intenté à Genève en 1553 contre Michel Servet. 1844. Reprinted in Calvin's Works. viii. 1870.
Sadoleto, J. Opera. 4 vols. Venice. 1737–8.
Sanuto, M. Diarii. Venice. 1879, etc
Sepulveda, J. G. de. Opera. 4 vols. Madrid. 1780.
Serristori, A. Legazioni. Florence. 1853.
State Papers, Calendar of Venetian. v. Ed. by Rawdon Brown. London. 1873.
Valdés, A. de. Litterae xi ineditae. Ed. E. Boehmer. In Homenaje a Menéndez y Pelayo. Ed. by Juan Valera. Vol. i. Madrid. 1899.
—— J. de. Trataditos. Ed. E. Boehmer. Bonn. 1880. And other tracts of Valdés edited by Boehmer.
Vergerio, P. P. Opera. Tübingen. 1563.
Wiffen, B. B. Life and writings of Juan Valdés, with a translation of his CX Considerations by J. T. Betts. London. 1865.

PRINCIPAL HISTORIES.

Boehmer, E. Bibliotheca Wiffeniana, Spanish Reformers of two Centuries from 1520. 2 vols. published. Strassburg and London. 1874, 1883.
Cantù, C. Gli Eretici d' Italia. 3 vols. Turin. 1865–7.
Carvalho, A. Herculano de. Historia da Origem e do Estabelecimento da Inquisição em Portugal. 3 vols. Lisbon. 1864, 1867, 1872.
Castro, A. de. Historia de los Protestantes españoles. Cadiz. 1851. Eng. translation by T. Parker. London. 1851.
Comba, E. I nostri Protestanti. 2 vols. published. Florence. 1881, 1897.
Gerdes, D. Specimen Italiae Reformatae Leyden. 1765
Leva, G. de Storia Documentata di Carlo V. Vol. III. Venice. 1867.
Llorente, J. A. Histoire critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne. 4 vols. Paris. 1818.
McCrie, T. History of the Reformation in Italy. Edinburgh. 1827. New edition, 1855.
—— History of the Reformation in Spain. Edinburgh 1829. New edition, 1855.
Menéndez y Pelayo, M. Historia de los Heterodoxos Españoles. 3 vols. Madrid. 1880–2.
Philippson, M. Zeitalter von Philipp II. und Elizabeth. 2 vols. Berlin. 1882–3.
—— La Contre-Révolution religieuse du XVIe siècle. 1884.
Schafer, E. Beitrage zur Geschichte des spanischen Protestantismus und der Inquisition. 3 vols. Gutersloh. 1902.
Wilkens, C. A. Geschichte des spanischen Protestantismus. Gütersloh. 1888.

SPECIAL TREATISES.

(Many of the following books contain documents previously unpublished.)

Agostini, A. Pietro Carnesecchi e il Movimento Valdesiano. Florence. 1899.
Amabili, L. Il santo Officio della Inquisizione in Napoli. 2 vols. Città di Castello. 1892.
Amante, B. Giulia Gongaza. Bologna. 1896.
Antonio, N. Bibliotheca Hispana Nova. 2 vols. Madrid. 1783–8.
Barros y Sousa, M. F. de *See* Santarem.
Battistella, A. Il s. Officio e la Riforma in Friuli. (With documents.) Udine. 1895.
Benrath, K. Über die Quellen der italienischen Reformations-Geschichte. Bonn. 1876.
—— Bernardino Ochino von Siena. Leipzig. 1875. New Edition. 1892. English translation without the documents. London. 1876.
—— Geschichte der Reformation in Venedig. Halle. 1887.
—— Julia Gonzaga. Halle. 1900.
Bernino, D. Istoria di tutte l' Eresie IV. Venice. 1745.
Bertolotti, A. Martiri del libero pensiero. 1891.
Bock, F. S. Historia Antitrinitariorum. Vol. II. Konigsberg and Leipzig. 1784.
Boehmer, E. Franzisca Hernandez und Frai Franzisco Ortiz. Leipzig. 1865.
Bonnet, J. Vie d'Olympia Morata. 3rd ed. Paris. 1856.
Boverio da Saluzzo, Z. Annali de' Fratri minori Cappucini. Venice. 1643.
Braun, W. Cardinal Gasparo Contarini. 1903.
Bruni, L. Cosimo I. de' Medici e il processo d' eresia del Carnesecchi. Turin. 1891.
Caballero, F. A. Vida de Melchor Cano. Madrid. 1871.
—— Juan y Alfonso Valdés. Madrid. 1875.
Cantù, C. Storia degli Italiani. Vol. X. 1876.

Cantù, C. Italiani illustri. Vol. II. Milan. 1879.
Carrasco, M. Alfonso et Juan de Valdés. Geneva. 1880.
Cecchetti, B. La republica di Venezia e la corte di Roma. 2 vols. Venice. 1874.
Christ, E. Spanische Glaubenshelden. Basel. 1886.
Coligny, L. L'antitrinitarianisme à Genève au temps de Calvin. 1873.
Cuccoli, E. M. Antonio Flaminio. Bologna. 1897.
Davari, S. Cenni storici intorno al Tribunale della Inquisizione in Mantova. Archivio Storico Lombardo VI. Milan. 1879.
Dittrich, F. Gasparo Contarini. Braunsberg. 1885.
Doumergue, E. Jean Calvin. Vol. II. Lausanne. 1903.
Droin, M. Histoire de la Réformation en Espagne. 2 vols. Lausanne and Paris. 1880.
Elze, Th. Geschichte der protestantischen Bewegungen in Venedig. Bielefeld. 1883.
Feliciangeli, B. Notizie sulla Caterina Cibo. Camerino. 1891.
Ferrai, E. Studi Storici, pp. 88–173. 1892.
Fontana, B. Renata di Francia. 3 vols. (Vol. II. Documenta.) Rome. 1889–99.
Gerdes, D. Scrinium Antiquarium sive Miscellanea Groningana. 8 vols. Bremen. 1749–65.
Hoefler, C. von. Papst Adrian VI. Vienna. 1880.
Hoermann, A. Francisco de Enzinas und sein Kreis. 1902.
Hubert, F. Vergerio's publizistische Thatigkeit Göttingen. 1893.
Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie. III. Hase on Carnesecchi and Altieri. IV. Benrath on Caraffa, etc. Leipzig. 1877–78.
Jensen, O. Gio. Pietro Caraffa og de religiose Strömninger i Italien paa hans Tid. Copenhagen. 1880.
Lafuente, M. Historia general de España. Vol. XIII. Madrid. 1854.
La Fuente, V. de. Historia Eclesiastica de España. Vol. V, pp. 205–206. Madrid. 1874.
La Mantia, V. Origine e Vicende dell' Inquisizione in Sicilia. 1886.
Lassalle, J. La Réforme en Espagne au XVI^e siècle. Paris. 1883.
Laugwitz, H. Bartholomaus Carranza. Kempten. 1870.
Linde, A. van der. Michael Servet, een brandoffer der gereformeerde inquisitie. Groningen. 1891.
Lüben, W. Gaetano di Tiene. 1883
Maurenbrecher, W. Studien und Skizzen zur Geschichte der Reformationszeit. Leipzig. 1874.
—— Geschichte der katholischen Reformation. Vol. I. Nordlingen. 1880.
Morsolin, B. Giangiorgio Trissino 1878.
Muratori, L. A. Delle Antichità Estensi ed Italiane. 2 vols. Modena. 1717–40.
Ploncher, A. Della vita e delle opere di Ludovico Castelvetro. 1879.
Porta, P. D. R. de. Historia reformationis ecclesiarum Raeticarum. 3 vols. Chur. 1771, 1776, 1786.
Ranke, L. von. Die romischen Papste. I. Vol. XXXVII of Sammtliche Werke, Leipzig, 1874 etc.
Reumont, A. von. Vittoria Colonna. Freiburg i. B. 1881. Italian translation by Müller and Ferrero, with additions by the Author. Turin. 1883.
Reusch, F. H. Luis de Léon. Bonn. 1873.
—— Der Index der verbotenen Bücher. Vol. I. Bonn. 1883.
Roberti, G. B. Notizie storico-critiche della vita de Francesco Negri. 1839.
Rodocanachi, E. Renée de France, in G. Guenard's Conférences de la Société d'études italiennes. Paris. 1895, 1896.
Rodrigo, F. J. G. Historia de la Inquisicion. II. Madrid. 1877.
Rosi, M. La Riforma religiosa in Liguria. Atti della Società ligure di Storia Patria. XXIV. Genoa 1894.

Sandonnini, T. Ludovico Castelvetro. Bologna. 1882.
Santarem, M. F. de Barros y Sousa, Visc. de, and others. Quadro Elementar das Relações Politicas de Portugal. Vols. x, xi, xii. Paris and Lisbon. 1866, 1869, 1874.
Schellhorn, J. G. Amoenitates Literariae. 14 vols. Frankfort and Leipzig. 1725–31.
—— Amoen. Historiae ecclesiasticae et litterariae. 2 vols. Frankfort and Leipzig. 1737–8.
—— De Consilio de emendanda Ecclesia. Zurich. 1748.
—— Ergotzlichkeiten aus der Kirchenhistorie und Literatur. 3 vols. Ulm and Leipzig. 1761–4.
Schiess, T. Rhetia, von F. Niger aus Bassano. [With biographical notice of Negri.] Chur. 1897.
Schmidt, C. Peter Martyr Vermigli. Elberfeld. 1858.
Sclopis, F. Le Cardinal Jean Morone. 1869.
Sixt, C. H. Petrus Paulus Vergerius. Brunswick. 1855. Later edition with additions. 1871.
Ticknor, G. History of Spanish Literature. 3 vols. 4th ed. Boston, Mass. 1872.
Tiraboschi, G. Biblioteca Modenese. 6 vols. Modena. 1781–6.
—— Storia della Litteratura Italiana. vii. Milan. 1822.
Tollin, H. Das Lehrsystem M. Servet's. 3 vols. Gutersloh. 1876–8–9
Trechsel, F. Die protestantischen Antitrinitarier. 2 vols. Heidelberg. 1839–44.
Vasconcellos, J. de Damião de Goes. Oporto. 1897.
Vecchiato, E. L' Inquisizione sacra a Venezia. 1891.
Young, M. Life and Times of Aonio Paleario. 2 vols. London. 1860.

See also Articles, etc. in

La Ciudad de Dios. Valladolid. 1887 ff.
Revista de España Madrid. 1868–1896.
Rivista Cristiana. Florence. 1873–1887.
Brieger's Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte. Gotha 1876 ff.
Wetzer-Welte, Kirchenlexicon. Ed. F. Kaulen. Freiburg i. B. 1886 ff.
Raumer's Historisches Taschenbuch. Leipzig. 1882.
Archivio Storico Italiano. xv, xvi. Florence. 1856–57.
Herzog-Hauck, Real-Encyklopadie für protestantische Theologie. Leipzig. 1877 f.

(*See also Bibliography of Chapter XVIII.*)

CHAPTER XIII.

HENRY VIII.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL.

There is but little unpublished matter of historical value connected with the reign of Henry VIII except State papers in English and foreign Archives; and of these full notices will be found in the Calendars published for the Master of the Rolls, with specific references to the sources. Of the collections in foreign countries the most important are:—

At Paris. Archives du Ministère des Affaires Étrangères. *See below under* Published Documents, Kaulek, J. *and* Lefèvre-Pontalis, G.

At Simancas. Archivo General Transcripts by Bergenroth are in the British Museum, Add. MSS. 28572–28595.

At Venice, Milan, etc. *See* Calendars, Venetian, *under* Published Documents.

At Rome. Vatican Archives and other Transcripts are in the Public Record Office. Notices of the documents will be found, each under its date, in the Calendar of Letters and Papers. *See also* Laemmer, H.; Theiner, A.; and Ehses, S. *under* Published Documents.

At Vienna. Transcripts of the Archives relating to England are in the Public Record Office, and notices of each separate document will be found under date in the Letters and Papers, and also in the Spanish Calendar.

ENGLAND.

Early Chronicles and Histories.

General.

Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London. Ed. by J. G. Nichols. Camden Soc. 1859.

Chronicle of Calais. Ed by J. G. Nichols. Camden Society. London. 1846.

Chronicle (Spanish) of King Henry VIII. Translated by M. A. S. Hume. London. 1889. [A strange, confused account by a Spaniard who was in England in the end of the reign.]

Fabyan, Robert. Chronicles. Ed. by Ellis. 1811.

Hall, E. Chronicle. London. 1548. Reprinted, 1809.

Herbert, Edward, Lord, of Cherbury. Life and Reign of Henry VIII. London. 1649 etc. (May be consulted in Kennett's Complete History of England. Vol. II. 1706.)

Holinshed, R. Chronicles. Vols. II and III. London. 1587.

London Chronicle in the times of Henry VII and Henry VIII. Ed. C. Hopper. Camden Miscellany. Vol. IV. 1859.
Stow, J. Chronicle. London. 1615.
Wriothesley, C. Chronicle. Vol. I. Ed. W. D. Hamilton. Camden Soc. 1875

Special.

Cavendish, G. Life of Wolsey. Kelmscott ed. 1893.
Chauncy, M. Historia aliquot Martyrum. Ed. V. M. Doreau. London. 1888.
Foxe, J. Acts and Monuments. Townsend's ed. Vols. IV, V. 1846.
—— Narratives of the Reformation. Ed. J. G. Nichols. Camden Soc. 1859.
Harpsfield, N. Treatise of the pretended Divorce between Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon. Ed. N. Pocock. Camden Soc. 1878.
More, Cresacre. Life and death of Sir Thomas More. Ed. J. Hunter. London. 1828.
Ortroy, Van (Bollandist). Vie du bienheureux Martyr, Jean Fisher. Brussels. 1893.
Roper, W. Life of Sir T. More. Paris. 1626. Chiswick. 1817.
Sanders, N. Historia Schismatis Anglicani. Cologne. 1628.
—— —— Translation by D. Lewis. London. 1877.
Stapleton, T. Tres Thomae. (Sir T. More being one.) Cologne. 1612.

Published Documents.

Actenstücke und Briefe zur Geschichte Kaiser Karls V. Monumenta Habsburgica. (Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.) Vienna. 1853, 1857.
Baga de Secretis, Calendar of. Third Report of Dep. Keeper of the Public Records App. II, 234–268.
Bradford, William. Correspondence of Charles V and his Ambassadors at the Courts of England and France. London 1850.
Calendars, Rolls Series:—
Letters and Papers, Henry VIII. Vols. III and following. Edd. J. S. Brewer, James Gairdner, R. H. Brodie. 1867 etc
Spanish State Papers. Vols. II and following. Edd. G. A. Bergenroth and P. de Gayangos. 1866 etc.
Venetian. Vols. III–V. Ed. Rawdon Brown. 1869–73.
Carew MSS. (1515–74). Edd. J. S. Brewer and W. Buller. 1867. [Vowell's Life of Sir Peter Carew, printed at the end of the Introduction, contains at pp lxxx, lxxxi an account of the loss of *the Mary Rose.*]
Collier, J. P. Trevelyan Papers. Parts I and II. Camden Soc. 1857, 1863.
Dasent, J. R. Acts of the Privy Council. New Series. Vol. I. Rolls Series. 1890.
Ehses, S. Romische Dokumente zur Geschichte der Ehescheidung Heinrichs VIII. von England, 1527–1534. Paderborn. 1893.
Ellis, Sir H. Original Letters. Three Series. 1824–46.
Erasmi Epistolæ. London. 1642. Another edition, by Leclerc, published at Leyden, 1703.—[The Epistles of Erasmus, translated and arranged in order of time by F. M. Nichols—only comes down, at least at present, to the accession of Henry VIII; but is of great value to the student.]
Excerpta Historica. 1831. Pp 260–5, 290–2.
Gee, H. and Hardy, W. H. Documents illustrative of English Church History. London. 1896.
Hales, J. A Discourse of the Commonweal of this realm of England. 1549. Ed. by E. Lamond. Cambridge. 1893.
Hamy's Entrevue. *See next Section.*

Haynes, S. State Papers, 1542-70. London. 1740.
Henry VIII's Love Letters to Anne Boleyn. Published by Hearne, App. to Robert of Avesbury, 347-361, and in the Harleian Miscellany, vol. III, 47-60; also by Editor of the *Historia Britonum* [W. Gunn] in the Pamphleteer, vol. XXI, 346-8 and vol. XXII, 114-123, with some valuable additional documents. They have also been published at Paris by Crapelet in an 8° volume, with the addition of a contemporary French poem containing a life of Anne Boleyn written a fortnight after her execution.
Historical MSS. Commission:—Calendar of the MSS. of the Marquis of Salisbury. Part I. 1883.
Jessopp, A. Monastic Visitations in the Diocese of Norwich. Camden Soc. 1888.
Kaulek, J. Correspondance politique de MM. de Castillon et de Marillac. Paris. 1885.
Laemmer, H. Monumenta Vaticana. Freiburg i. B. 1861.
Lanz, Karl. Correspondenz des Kaisers Karl V. Vols. I, II. Leipzig. 1844-5.
Leach, A. F. Visitations of Southwell. Camden Soc. 1891.
Lefèvre-Pontalis, G. Correspondance politique d'Odet de Selve. Commission des Archives Diplomatiques. Paris. 1888.
Merriman, R. B. Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell. 2 vols. Oxford. 1902. [The collection of letters includes all those known to have been written by Cromwell.]
Nichols, J. G. Inventories of the Household Stuff of Henry Fitzroy Duke of Richmond, and of Katherine Princess Dowager. Camden Miscellany. Vol. III. 1885.
Nicolas, Sir N. H. Proceedings and Ordinances of the Privy Council. Record Commission. Vol. VII.
Pocock, N. Records of the Reformation. 2 vols. Oxford. 1870.
Pole, Cardinal R. Epistolæ. Ed Quirini Brixen. 1744-57.
Rutland Papers. Ed. Jerdan. Camden Soc 1842.
Rymer, T. Fœdera. Vols XIV, XV. 1st ed.
Scotland. The late Expedicion in Scotlande...under the Erle of Hertforde, 1544. Printed by Reynold Wolfe, 1544. Reprinted by John Graham Dalzell in Fragments of Scottish History. Edinburgh. 1798.
State Papers, Henry VIII. 11 vols. Published by the Government. 1830-52. Vol. I. (in two Parts) contains Domestic State Papers; vols. II, III, Irish; vols. IV, V, Scotch; vols. VI—XI, Foreign.
Statute of the Realm. Vol. III 1817
Theiner, A. Vetera Monumenta Hibernorum et Scotorum historiam illustrantia. Romæ. 1864.
Turnbull, W. B. Account of Monastic Treasures confiscated at the Dissolution. By Sir John Williams, master and treasurer of the jewels to Henry VIII. Abbotsford Club. Edinburgh 1836.
Wilkins, D. Concilia. Vol. III. 1737.
Wright, T. Suppression of the Monasteries. Camden Soc. 1843.

See also Collections in the Church Histories of Burnet, Collier and Dodd.

Principal Modern Histories.

So much new light has been thrown upon this period, that all previous general histories of England, such as those of Hume, Rapin, Lingard and Froude, require very material correction as well as enlargement. The same is also the case with the most familiar Church Histories, viz. those of Burnet, Collier and Dodd, though

their collections of documents are of great value. The following works are named as embodying some of the results of recent research:—

Brewer, J. S. The Reign of Henry VIII. 2 vols. London. 1884.
Clowes, W. L. The Royal Navy. Vol. I. London. 1897.
Dixon, R. W. History of the Church of England. Vols. I, II. London. 1878, 1
Doreau, V. M. Henri VIII et les Martyrs de la Chartreuse de Londres. P 1890.
Du Boys, A. Catherine d'Aragon et les Origines du Schisme Anglican. Gen 1880. Translation by C. M. Yonge. 2 vols. London. 1881.
Friedmann, P Anne Boleyn. 2 vols. 1884.
Gairdner, James. The English Church in the Sixteenth Century. 1902.
Gasquet, F. A. Henry VIII and the English Monasteries. 2 vols. London. 1 Revised popular edition in one volume. London. 1899.
Green, M. A. E. Lives of the Princesses of England. Vols IV and V. Lon 1849–55.
Hamy, A. Entrevue de François Premier avec Henry VIII à Boulogne sur Me 1532. Paris 1898. With valuable collection of documents.
Hendriks, L. The London Charter-house. London. 1889.
Merriman, R. B. Life and Letters of Thomas Cromwell. 2 vols. Oxford. 19
Pollard, A. F. Henry VIII. London. 1902. [With valuable engravings f contemporary pictures.]
Ranke, L. von. Englische Geschichte, vornehmlich im sechzehnten und siebzehn Jahrhundert. Vol. I. Vol. XIV of Sammtliche Werke. Berlin. 1874 etc.
—— A History of England (translation of the preceding). Vol. I. Oxford. 18
Strickland, A. Lives of the Queens of England. Vol II. London. 1854.
Stubbs, W. (Bishop). Seventeen Lectures on the Study of Medieval and Mod History. Lectures XI, XII. Oxford. 1887. 1900.

Auxiliary Information.

Anderson, C. The Annals of the English Bible. 2 vols. London. 1845.
Armstrong, E. Charles V. London. 1902.
Ashley, W. J. Introduction to English Economic History. London. 1892.
Bapst, E. Deux Gentilshommes-Poètes de la Cour de Henri VIII. Paris. 189
Bridgett, T. E. Lives of Fisher (1888) and More (1891).
Busch, W. Cardinal Wolsey und die englisch-kaiserliche Allianz, 1522–5. Bo 1886
—— Der Ursprung der Ehescheidung Konig Heinrichs VIII. von Engla Historisches Taschenbuch, Sechste Folge, VIII, 271–327.
—— Der Sturz des Cardinals Wolsey. Historisches Taschenbuch, Sechste Fol IX, 39–114.
Creighton, M. (Bishop). Cardinal Wolsey Twelve English Statesmen Seri London. 1888.
Cunningham, W. Growth of English Industry and Commerce. Cambridge. 18
Du Bellay, Martin Mémoires. Michaud et Poujoulat, V.
Early English Text Society's Publications:—England in the Reign of Henry VI 1871, 1878.
—— Four Supplications 1871.
English Historical Review. XI, 673–702. XII, 1–16, 237–253. London. 1896–
Furnivall, F. J. Ballads from MSS. Ballad Society. 1868–72.
Gasquet, F. A. The Eve of the Reformation. London. 1900.
Gratianus, Orthuinus. Fasciculus Rerum expetendarum et fugiendarum. Ci Appendice operâ Edwardi Brown. London. 1690.

Jacqueton, G. La Politique extérieure de Louise de Savoie. Paris. 1892.
Jusserand, J. A. A. F. English Wayfaring Life in the Middle Ages. Translated by L. Toulmin Smith. London. 1892.
Leadam, I. S. The Domesday of Inclosures, 1517-8. Royal Hist. Soc. London. 1897. Comp. Royal Hist. Society's Transactions, N.S. vi, 167; vii, 127; viii, 251 and xiv, 231-303.
Mignet, F. A. M. Rivalité de François I et de Charles Quint. Paris. 1875.
Mullinger, J. B. The University of Cambridge. Vols. i and ii. Cambridge. 1873, 1884.
Oppenheim, M. A History of the Administration of the Royal Navy and of Merchant Shipping in relation to the Navy. 1506-1660. London. 1897.
Pauli, R. Aufsatze zur Englischen Geschichte. Leipzig. 1869.
—— —— Neue Folge. Leipzig. 1883.
—— Drei volkswirthschaftliche Denkschriften aus der Zeit Heinrichs VIII. Gottingen. 1878. In vol. xxiii of Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen.
Rogers, J. E. T. The History of Agriculture and Prices. Vol. iv. Oxford. 1882.
Royal Historical Society's Publications (*see also* Leadam, I. S.):—
Transactions, Old Series. iv, 260. Memoir of Geo. Wishart. By Ch. Rogers. viii, 242. Henry VIII's 'Assertio Septem Sacramentorum.' By J. M. Brown.
—— New Series. vi, 167. The Inquisition of 1517; also vii, 127 and viii, 251. By I. S. Leadam. vii, 21. Notes on the Family of Betoun. By H. E. Malden. ix, 167. The Tudors and the Currency. By C. W. C. Oman. xiii, 75. The Fall of Cardinal Wolsey. By J. Gairdner. xiv, 231. The Inquisitions of Depopulation in 1517. By E. F. Gay (in answer to Leadam).
Russell, F. W. Kett's Rebellion in Norfolk. London. 1859.
Schanz, G. Die Handelsbeziehungen zwischen England und den Niederlanden, 1485-1547. Wurzburg. 1879.
Seebohm, F. The Oxford Reformers of 1498. John Colet, Erasmus, Thomas More. 3rd ed. London. 1896.
Shaw, W. A. History of Currency. London. 1895.
Skelton, J. Poetical Works. Ed A. Dyce. 2 vols. London. 1843.
Strype, John. 'Memorials of Cranmer' and 'Ecclesiastical Memorials,' valuable chiefly for their documents.
Trollope, E. On Anne Askew, in Associated Architectural Societies' Report, vi. 117-134.
Westcott, B. F. (Bishop). History of the English Bible. London. 1868.
Wood, Ant. à. Hist. and Antiquities of the University of Oxford. Vol. ii. Oxford. 1796.

SCOTLAND.

See Bibliography in Brown, P. H. History of Scotland. Vol. i. Cambridge. 1899.

Published Documents.

Bannatyne Miscellany. Vol. i. Edin.
Exchequer Rolls of Scotland. Vols. xv-xviii. Ed. by G. P. McNeill. Register House Series.
Hamilton Papers. 2 vols. Ed. by J. Bain. Register House Series.
Register of the Privy Council of Scotland. Vol. i. Ed. by J. H. Burton. Register House Series.
Ruddimann, T. Epistolæ Jacobi Quarti, Jacobi Quinti et Mariæ, Regum Scotorum. Edin. 1722-4.

State Papers. *See above.* [Vols. IV and V relate to Scotland.]
Teulet, A. Papiers d'État...relatifs à l'histoire de l'Écosse. Bannatyne Club. Vol. I. Paris. [1851.]
—— Relations politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Écosse au 16^{me} siècle. Paris and Bordeaux. 1862. [Virtually identical in its contents with the preceding.]
Theiner, A. *See above,* England, Published Documents.
The late Expedicion in Scotlande. *See above,* ibid.

HISTORIES.

Bapst, E. Les Mariages de Jaques V. Paris. 1889.
Brown, P. Hume. History of Scotland. Vols. I, II. Cambridge. 1899, 1902.
Buchanan, G. Rerum Scoticarum Historia. Edinburgh. 1582 etc.
—— —— Translation by Aikman. 4 vols. Glasgow. 1827.
Diurnal of Occurrents. Bannatyne Club. Edinburgh. 1833.
Green, M. A. E. Lives of the Princesses of England. Vol. IV.
Holinshed, R. Chronicles. Vol. I London. 1587.
Herkless, J. Cardinal Beaton. Edin. 1891.
Knox, John. Works. Vol. I. History of the Reformation. Ed. by D. Laing. Bannatyne Club. Edinburgh. 1846.
Lesley, J. History of Scotland. Edin. 1830.
Pinkerton, J. History of Scotland. London. 1797.
Strickland, A. Lives of the Queens of Scotland. Vols. I, II. Edin. 1850-1.
Tytler, P. F. History of Scotland. Eadie's edition. Vol. II. Glasgow. [1873-7.]
Wright, Thomas. History of Scotland. 3 vols. London and New York. 1856.

IRELAND.

PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS.

Calendar of the State Papers relating to Ireland. Ed. H. C. Hamilton. Vol. I. 1860.
Calendar of the Carew MSS. at Lambeth. Ed. J. S. Brewer and W. Bullen. Vol. I 1867.
State Papers, Henry VIII. *See above.* [Vols. II and III relate to Ireland.]

HISTORIES.

Annals of the Four Masters. Ed. J. O'Donovan. Vol. III. Dublin. 1848.
Bagwell, R. Ireland under the Tudors. Vol. I. 1885.
Holinshed, R. Chronicles. Vol. I. London. 1587.
Richey, A. G. A short History of the Irish People. Dublin. 1887.
Wright, Thomas. History of Ireland. 2 vols. London. 1854.

CHAPTER XIV.

THE REFORMATION UNDER EDWARD VI.

MANUSCRIPTS.

A. State Papers.

The Domestic State Papers of the reign of Edward VI in the Record Office are comparatively scanty, there being only nineteen volumes in the regular series, and seven volumes of Addenda (consisting chiefly of documents relating to Scotland and the Borders). The Foreign State Papers include an imperfect series of despatches from English representatives abroad, transcripts of despatches from foreign ambassadors resident in England, and a series entitled the Calais Papers. Many were transcribed with a view to a new edition of Rymer's Foedera, and a list of them is printed in vol. III, pp. xxxiv—liii, of Hardy's Syllabus, 1885. There are also five volumes of State Papers relating to Scotland For other diplomatic correspondence, see type-written Lists of Transcripts in the Record Office; and Reports 33, 36, 39, 42-7 of the Deputy Keeper of Records.

The State Papers at the British Museum are numerous, but, not as a rule being arranged according to subject, they are difficult to consult; there are, however, Bergenroth's Transcripts of Simancas Papers (Add. MSS. 28595-7) and a series of Scottish State Papers known as the Hamilton Papers (Add. MSS. 32091, 32647-8, 32654, and 32657). Other single volumes of great value are scattered throughout the Cotton, Harley, Lansdowne, Royal, Stowe, and Additional Collections, and the only guide to them is to be found in the various MS. Class Catalogues kept in the MSS. Department at the Museum. Some of the more important volumes are Edward VI's Journal (Cotton MS. Nero C. x), the Privy Council's Warrant Book (Royal MS. 18 C. xxiv), Starkey's collection of letters and papers (Harley MS. 353), and the documents relating to Somerset's agrarian policy (Lansdowne MS. 238).

The Privy Council's Register is at the Privy Council Office in Whitehall; the Inner Temple Library possesses a valuable collection of State Papers entitled the Petyt MSS.; the Talbot Papers in the College of Arms contain some six thousand public and private letters dating from the sixteenth century; the Marquis of Salisbury's collection at Hatfield includes some three hundred documents relating to the reign, and isolated State Papers are to be found in many other private libraries.

B. Miscellaneous MSS.

Besides State Papers, the Record Office contains a vast mass of materials to which the historian must have occasional recourse. Such are the Patent and Close Rolls, the records of the Star Chamber, the Admiralty Courts and Court of

Requests, the Courts of Augmentations, First Fruits and Tenths, and the Baga de Secretis, which contains records of the state trials (cf. J. Scargill-Bird's Guide to the Record Office, 2nd ed. 1896). Acts of Parliament not printed in the Statutes at Large may be found in the Rolls of Parliament at the Record Office, but Acts not entered on the Roll and not printed in the Statutes at Large must be sought at the Parliament Office. The Society of Antiquaries possesses an interesting collection of MS. Proclamations.

C. Ecclesiastical Documents.

The most important unpublished sources are the episcopal registers, particularly those of the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Bishop of London. The records of Convocation were destroyed at the Fire of London, but a collection of Synodalia, 1547–1580, exists in Brit. Mus. Egerton MS. 2350. In the British Museum the Lansdowne Collection is particularly rich in ecclesiastical MSS.; volumes 335, 388, 389, 819 and 1045 contain some of Foxe the martyrologist's papers, and others are extant in Harley MSS. 416—426 and 590. The Royal Collection has other ecclesiastical documents of interest, particularly the report (Royal MS. 17 B xxxix) of the debate in the Lords on the first Act of Uniformity, the earliest report of a parliamentary debate extant (cf. also MS. Class Catalogue, 'Church History,' in Brit. Museum Department of MSS). Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, has a valuable collection of Cranmer's papers bequeathed by Archbishop Parker (cf. Nasmith's Catalogus, 1777). There are also some MSS. of importance at Lambeth (see H. J. Todd's Catalogue, 1812).

CONTEMPORARY PRINTED AUTHORITIES.

1. Calendars.

The Calendar of Domestic State Papers (ed. Lemon, 1856) is inadequate, but the Addenda for Edward VI's reign (ed. M. A. E. Green, and appended 1870 to the Domestic Calendar for 1601-3) is more satisfactory. The Foreign Calendar (ed. Turnbull, 1861) is also adequate. The Scottish Calendar (ed. Thorpe, 1858) is superseded, so far as Edward VI's reign is concerned, by the Calendar of Scottish State Papers (ed. Bain, Edinburgh, 1898), and the Venetian Calendar (ed. Rawdon Brown, 1873) contains little of importance except Barbaro's Relation (pp. 338—362). The Hamilton Papers have been printed in full by the Lord Clerk Register of Scotland (2 vols., ed. Bain, Edinburgh, 1890).

2. Other Collections of State Papers.

Correspondance Politique d'Odet de Selve. 1546-9. French Foreign Office. Paris. 1888.

Ribier, G. Lettres et Mémoires d'Estat. Paris. 2 vols. 1666.

Teulet, A. Relations Politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Écosse. 5 vols. Paris. 1862

—— Papiers d'État relatifs à l'histoire de l'Écosse au XVI^e siècle. Bannatyne Club. 3 vols. Edinburgh. 1851–60.

Vertot, l'Abbé. Ambassades des Noailles en Angleterre. 5 vols. Leyden. 1763.

Weiss, C. Papiers d'État du Cardinal de Granvelle. Coll. de Doc. Inédits. 9 vols. Paris. 1841–52.

A few documents relating to the period are also printed in the Hardwicke Papers, edited by the 2nd Earl of Hardwicke, 2 vols., London, 1778; and the Sadleir State Papers, edited by A. Clifford, 2 vols., Edinburgh, 1809.

3. Collections of Private Letters and Papers.

Ellis, Sir H. Original Letters. (From the British Museum.) 11 vols. London. 1824–1846.

Haynes, S. Burghley State Papers. London. 1740.

Kempe, A. J. Loseley MSS. (Selections from Papers at Loseley Park, Guildford.) London. 1835.

Lodge, E. Illustrations of British History, etc. (Letters in the College of Arms.) 2nd ed. 3 vols. London. 1838.

Pocock, N. Troubles connected with the First Book of Common Prayer. (Papers selected from the Petyt MSS.) Camden Soc. London. 1884.

Reports and Appendices to Reports of the Historical MSS. Commission. (These are too numerous to be mentioned in detail; the most important is the Calendar of Lord Salisbury's MSS. The Papers at Longleat are inadequately represented in the Report, but some of the more interesting are printed in the Wilts Archaeological Magazine, vols. xv, xvi; compare also 1st Rep. App., p. 42, 2nd Rep. App., pp. 41, 45, 151, 152.)

4. Parliamentary and Official.

Acts of the Privy Council. Ed. J. R. Dasent. Vols. ii–iv. London. 1890–2.

Dumont, J. Corps Universel Diplomatique. 8 vols. The Hague. 1725.

Journals of the House of Commons. Vol. i. London, n. d.

Journals of the House of Lords. Vol. i London, n. d.

Official Return of Members of Parliament. 4 pts. London. 1878–1891. [These are the only lists of members extant, but they are very incomplete in the 16th century.]

Proclamations. London. 1550. (A collected volume of Proclamations. 1547–1550.)

Rymer, T. Foedera. Original ed. 1704–1717. 17 vols.

Statutes of the Realm. Record Commission. Vol. iv, Part 1. 1819.

See also the Reports of the Deputy-Keeper of Records; esp. Appendix to Rep. iv, summarising the contents of the Baga de Secretis, and Lists and Indexes issued by the Record Office

5. Contemporary Chronicles, Tracts, etc.

Chronicle of Queen Jane and Queen Mary. London. Camden Soc. 1850.

Cooper, T. Epitome of Chronicles. London. 1560.

Grafton, R. Chronicle. London. 1568. New ed. 2 vols. London. 1809.

Greyfriars' Chronicle. Camden Soc. London. 1852.

Hoby, Sir T. Travels and Life, 1547–64. Camden Soc. Miscellany, vol. x, 1902.

Literary Remains of Edward VI. Roxburghe Club. Ed. J. G. Nichols. 2 vols. London. 1857. [Contains all the extant writings of the young King and prints many other illustrative documents. Edward VI's statements must always be received with caution, but these two volumes are the most valuable of all printed collections for the history of the reign.]

Machyn, H. Diary. Camden Soc. London. 1847.

Narratives of the Reformation. Camden Soc. London. 1860.

Ponet, Bishop. Treatise of Politicke Power. 1556. Other editions, 1639 and 1642.

Smith, Sir T. De Republica Anglorum. London. 1583. The only adequate contemporary account of the English constitution.

Spanish Chronicle of Henry VIII. Ed. M. A. S. Hume. London. 1889. [Untrustworthy.]

Wriothesley, C. Chronicle. Camden Soc. 2 vols. London. 1875.

6. ECCLESIASTICAL.

Bucer, M. Scripta Anglicana. Basel. 1577.
Cardwell, E. Documentary Annals of the Reformed Church of England. 2 vols. Oxford. 1844.
Foxe, J. Acts and Monuments. 8 vols. Ed. G. Townsend. London. 1843-9. [Contains a vast number of facts and documents, and its errors are certainly not greater than in similar works.]
Knox, John. Works. Bannatyne Club. 6 vols. Edinburgh. 1846-64. [Especially the Admonition to the Professors of the Truth in England.]
Pole, R. Epistolae. 5 vols. Brescia. 1744-57.
Sleidan. [Philippson, Jean.] Commentarii, Strassburg, 1555, and History of the Reformation from 1517 to 1556. Ed. 1689.
Sparrow, A. Collection of Articles, Injunctions, and Canons. London. 1661.
Wilkins, David. Concilia. London. 1737. 4 vols.
Zurich Letters and Original Letters. Parker Soc. 4 vols. 1846-7.

See also the works of Cranmer, Coverdale, Hooper, Latimer, Bale, Bradford, Bullinger, Becon, Hutchinson, Ridley (all published by the Parker Society). A similar Corpus of the works of Roman Catholic divines is needed. The most important contemporary statements of the Roman Catholic case are Gardiner's Explanation and Assertion of the True Catholic Faith, 1551, and Confutatio Cavillationum, Paris, 1552; Tunstall's De Veritate, Paris, 1554; and (Bishop) Thomas Watson's Wholesome and Catholic Doctrine (London, 1558, re-ed. by T. E. Bridgett, London, 1876).

7. SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC.

Ballads from MSS. Ballad Society. Ed. F. J. Furnivall. London. 1868.
Brynkelow, H. Complaynt of Roderick Mors. Early English Text Society. 1874.
Crowley, R. Works. Early English Text Society. 1872.
Discourse of the Commonweal. Ed. E. Lamond. Cambridge. 1893.
Four Supplications of the Commons. Early English Text Society. 1871.
Lever, Thomas. Sermons. Ed. E. Arber. London. 1871.
Starkey, Thomas. England under Henry VIII. Early English Text Soc. 1871.
Tusser, T. Hundred Points of Husbandry. London. 1557.
Wilson, T. Discourse upon Usury. London. 1572.

8. RELATIONS WITH SCOTLAND.

Berteville, Sir J. Recit de l'Expédition en Écosse (1547). Bannatyne Club. 1825.
Patten, W. Expedition into Scotland. In Tudor Tracts. Ed. A. F. Pollard. Arber's English Garner. 1903.
The Complaynt of Scotland, Epitome of the King of England's Title to the Sovereignty of Scotland, Henryson's Godly and Golden Book, and Somerset's Epistle to the Nobility of Scotland, are all edited for the Early English Text Soc. 1872.

SECONDARY AUTHORITIES.

A. GENERAL.

Carte, T. History of England. 4 vols. London. 1747-55. Oxford. 6 vols. 1851.
Froude, J. A. History of England. 12 vols. London. 1856-1870. [The only History which has made adequate use of the foreign correspondence of the reign.]

Hayward, Sir J. Life and Reign of Edward VI. London. 1630.
Holinshed, Raphael. Chronicles. 3 vols. London. 1577.
Lingard, J. History of England. 8 vols. London. 1819–1830.
Pollard, A. F. England under Protector Somerset. 1900. (With bibliography.)
Rapin de Thoyras, Paul. Histoire d'Angleterre. 13 vols. The Hague. 1724–36.
Speed, J. History of Great Britain. London. 1611.
Stow, J. Annals. London. 1631.
Turner, S. Modern History of England. 2 vols. London. 1826, 1829.
Tytler, P. F. England in the Reigns of Edward VI and Mary. 2 vols. London. 1839. [Important for the documents printed in it.]

B. Ecclesiastical.

Blunt, J. H. The Reformation of the Church in England. London. Vol. II. 1896.
Burnet, G. History of the Reformation. 3 vols. London. 1679, 1715. Ed. Pocock. 7 vols. Oxford. 1865. [The latter is an excellent edition, containing much new matter and Wharton's Specimen of Errors; originally published in 1693 under the pseudonym 'Anthony Harmer.']
Collier, Jeremy. Ecclesiastical History. Ed. Lathbury. 9 vols. London. 1852.
Dixon, R. W. History of the Church of England. Vols. II and III. 2nd ed. London. 1893.
Dodd, C. Church History. Ed. Tierney. 5 vols. London. 1839–1843.
Fuller, T. Church History. London. 1655. Ed. J. S. Brewer. 6 vols. Oxford. 1845.
Gairdner, J. The English Church from 1509 to 1558. London. 1902. (With bibliographical notes.)
Heylyn, P. Ecclesia Restaurata. London. 1661. Ed. Robertson. 2 vols. London. 1849.
Maitland, S. R. Essays on the Reformation. London. 1899.
Sanders, N. De Origine ac Progressu Schismatis. Cologne. 1585. Transl. Lewis. London. 1877.
Soames, H. History of the Reformation. 4 vols. London. 1826–8.
Spelman, Sir H. History of Sacrilege. London. 1698.
Strype, J. Ecclesiastical Memorials and Life of Cranmer London. (In Oxford edit. 26 vols. 1820 sqq.) [An indispensable authority.]

SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

A. Constitutional History.

Atterbury, F. (Bishop). Rights and Privileges of an English Convocation. 2nd ed. London. 1701.
Bailey, A. Succession to the English Crown. London. 1879.
Child, G. W. Church and State under the Tudors. London. 1890.
Cobbett, W. State Trials. Vol. I. London. 1809.
—— Parliamentary History. London. 1806.
Dicey, A. V. The Privy Council. Oxford. 1860.
Gibson, E. Synodus Anglicana. Ed. E. Cardwell. Oxford. 1854.
Harbin, George. The Hereditary Right of the Crown of England. [Erroneously ascribed to Hilkiah Bedford.] London. 1713.
Lathbury, T. History of the Convocation of the Church of England. 2nd ed. London. 1853.

Leadam, I. S. The Star Chamber. Selden Soc. 1904.
—— The Court of Requests. Selden Soc. 1898.
Makower, F. Constitutional History of the Church of England. (Engl. transl.) London. 1895.
Meyer, A. O. Die englische Diplomatie in Deutschland zur Zeit Eduards VI. Breslau 1900.
Oppenheim, M. History of the Administration of the Navy. London. 1896.
Porritt, E. The Unreformed House of Commons. 2 vols. Cambridge. 1903.
Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Courts. London. 2 vols. 1883.
Scofield, C. L. The Star Chamber. Chicago. 1900. (Cf. 'Calendar of Star Chamber Proceedings' in Dep.-Keeper of Records' 49th Rep; and 'List of Star Chamber Proceedings,' 1485–1558, in R. O. 'Lists and Indexes,' vol. XIII, 1902.)
Stanford, Sir W. Exposition of the King's Prerogative. London. 1567.

B. Social and Economic.

Ashley, W. J. English Economic History. (With bibliography.) Vol. I, pt 2. 1893.
Cheyney, E. P. Social Changes in England in the 16th Century. Philadelphia, Pa. 1895. (With bibliography.)
Cobbett, W. Protestant Reformation. London. 2 pts. 1824, 1827. Ed. F. A Gasquet. 1896
Cunningham, W. Growth of English Industry and Commerce. 3rd ed. Cambridge. 1896–1903.
Dowell, S. History of Taxation. 2nd ed. 4 vols London 1888
Leadam, I. S. Domesday of Enclosures. Royal Hist Soc. 2 vols. London. 1897.
Prothero, R. E. Pioneers and Progress of English Farming London. 1888.
Rogers, T History of Agriculture and Prices in England. Vols. III, IV. Oxford. 1882.
Russell, F. W. Kett's Rebellion. London. 1859. [Prints many documents.]
Smith, J. Memoirs of Wool. 2 vols. 1747.

C. The English Bible, Church Services and Ornaments.

Anderson, C. Annals of the Bible 2 vols. London 1845.
Certificates of Chantry Commissioners Surtees Soc. Vol. XCI. Durham. 1894.
Cotton, H. Editions of the Bible in England, 1505–1850. Oxford. 1852.
Dore, J. R. Old English Bibles. 2nd ed London 1888.
Gasquet, F. A and Bishop, E. Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer. London. 1890. [A most valuable book.]
Grove, Sir G. Dictionary of Music. 4 vols London. 1878–1889.
Inventories of Church Goods. Surtees Society. Vol. 97. Durham. 1897.
Julian, J. Dictionary of Hymnology. London. 1892.
Lancashire Chantries. Ed. F. R. Raines. Chetham Society. Manchester. 1862
Liturgies of Edward VI Parker Society. Ed. J Ketley. Cambridge. 1844.
Mély, F. de, and Bishop, E. Bibliographie Générale des Inventaires imprimés. 3 vols. Paris. 1892–5.
Micklethwaite, J. T. The Ornaments of the Rubric. Alcuin Club Tracts. London. 1897.
Nightingale, J. E. Church Plate of Dorset, 1889, and of Wilts, 1891. Salisbury.
North, T. Church Bells of Leicestershire, 1876; of Northamptonshire, 1878; Rutland, 1880; Lincolnshire, 1882.—Leicester. Bedfordshire, 1883; Hertfordshire, 1887.—London.
Parker, J. The First Prayer-Book of Edward VI. Oxford. 1877.
Peacock, E. English Church Furniture in Lincolnshire. 1866.

Procter, F. and Frere, W. H. New History of the Book of Common Prayer. London. 1901.
Pullan, L. History of the Book of Common Prayer. London. 1900.
Somerset Chantries. Ed. E. Green. Somerset Record Soc. London. 1888.
Todd, H. J. Observations on the Metrical Versions of the Psalms by Sternhold, Hopkins and others. London. 1822.
Trollope, A. Church Plate of Leicestershire. Leicester. 1890.

D. Biography.

Cranmer, Archbishop. Lives of, by H. J. Todd (2 vols. 1831), C. W. Le Bas (2 vols. 1833), Dean Hook in Lives of the Archbishops of Canterbury (12 vols. 1860–76) and A. F. Pollard (1904).
Dictionary of National Biography. 66 vols. London. 1885–1901.
Hennessy, G. Novum Repertorium Eccl. Londin. London 1898.
Le Neve, J. Fasti Eccl. Anglicanae. Ed. Sir T. D Hardy. 3 vols. Oxford. 1854.
Nares, E. Memoirs of Lord Burleigh. Vol I. London. 1828
Newcourt, R. Repertorium Eccl. Londin Parochiale. 2 vols. London. 1708, 1710
Stubbs, W. (Bishop). Reg Sacrum Anglicanum. 2nd ed. Oxford. 1897.
Wordsworth, C. Ecclesiastical Biography. 4th ed. 4 vols London. 1853.

E. Debasement of the Coinage.

Hawkins, E. Silver Coins of England. London. 1887.
Oman, C. W. C. In Trans. Royal Hist. Soc. New Ser. Vol. IX. London. 1895.
Ruding, R. Annals of the Coinage. 3rd ed. Ed. Akerman. 3 vols. London. 1840.

F. Education and the Universities.

Carlisle, N. Endowed Grammar Schools. 2 vols. London. 1818.
Cooper, C H. Athenae Cantab. 2 vols. Cambridge. 1858–61.
—— Annals of Cambridge. 4 vols. Cambridge. 1842–52.
Leach, A. F. English Schools at the Reformation. Westminster. 1896.
Mullinger, J. B. History of the University of Cambridge. Vol. II. Cambridge. 1884.
Wood, A. Athenae Oxonienses. Ed. Bliss 4 vols. London. 1813–1820.
—— Hist. et Antiquitates Univ. Oxon. Ed. Gutch. 2 vols. Oxford. 1791–6.
—— Colleges and Halls of Oxford, with the 'Fasti Oxon.' Ed. Gutch. Oxford. 1790.

G. Topography.

Camden, W. Britannia. London. 1586. Ed. Gibson and Gough. 3 vols. London. 1789.
Leland, J. Itinerary. Ed. Hearne. 9 vols. Oxford. 1770.
Norden, Saxton, and Speed's maps. Published 1600–1620. Among the Cotton Charters in the British Museum MSS. Department are a number of unpublished contemporary maps, plans, sketches of fortifications in England and abroad, e.g. Boulogne, Calais, etc, which are necessary for a clear understanding of military operations. Published contemporary maps are very scarce. Cf. J. P. Anderson, British Topography, London, 1881.
Stow, J. Survey of London. 1598. Ed. Strype. 2 vols London. 1720.

CHAPTER XV.

PHILIP AND MARY.

(Chiefly supplementary to Bibliography for Chapter XIV, the authorities being, in many cases, the same.)

MANUSCRIPTS.

A. State Papers and Correspondence.

The Domestic State Papers of Mary's reign preserved in the Record Office are comprised in fourteen volumes for England, with eight volumes of Addenda; two volumes for Ireland and part of one for Scotland. Of the transcripts of Papers at Simancas by G. A. Bergenroth at the British Museum only a small portion (Add. MSS. 28597, ff. 110–221) relate to the reign of Mary

B. Calendars of State Papers and Correspondence.

I. *Domestic.*

1. Calendar of State Papers of the Reigns of Edward VI, Mary, Elizabeth, ed. by R. Lemon 1856. 2 *Foreign.* Calendar of State Papers of the Reign of Mary, ed by William B. Turnbull 1861. [This volume contains errors in the assigned dates, corrections of which are given in A. O. Meyer, Die Englische Diplomatie in Deutschland, etc. pp 109–111] 3. Calendar of State Papers and Manuscripts relating to English Affairs in the Archives of Venice and other Libraries in Northern Italy. Edited by Rawdon Brown, vol. v (1534–1554); vol. vi (1554–1558). Catalogue des Manuscrits Français. Tome Ier, Ancien Fonds. Paris. 1868. Nos. 2846, 2933, 5113, 5127. Letters and Memorials of State in the Reign of Queen Mary, etc. Translated from the Originals at Penshurst in Kent. By Arthur Collins. 2 vols. 1746.

II. *Other Collections.*

1. Calendar of the MSS. belonging to the Marquis of Salisbury, preserved at Hatfield House, published by the Historical MSS. Commission. Part i, pp. 93–94; no. 375 (where for 1551 read 1553) supplies facts relating to Mary's movements subsequent to Edward's death; see also pp. 123, 125. Part ii, pp. 85, 146, 241, 243, 269, 288, 291–293, 332, 345 [useful generally for precedents established in Mary's reign]. 2. Calendar of MSS. belonging to the Corporation of Reading: Ein Kurtze anzeygung der ding, so sich in Engellandt zwischen den Koniglichen Majestaten, Konig und Konigin und dem Cardinal Polum verloffen haben [1554]. xiii. 284–295. 3. Calendar of MSS. belonging to Sir Richard Sutton, pp. 66–67, 89–92.

C. Diplomatic.

1. **Commendone, I. F.** Lettere, in Miscellanea di Storia Italiana. Vol. vi. 1865. 2. **Michiel, Giovanni,** Les Dépêches de, Ambassadeur de Venise en Angleterre pendant les années de 1554 à 1557, dechiffrées et publiées d'après les documents conservés aux archives nationales de Venise, par P. Friedmann. Venice, 1869. [In Italian; Friedmann's discovery of the key to the cipher was a memorable achievement. The letters addressed to the Senate of Venice are of the highest interest, although, unfortunately, those for 1554 are lost; they include his 'Report of England' made in 1557 (a description decried by Froude but praised by Rawdon Brown), to be found in English in Ellis, Original Letters (2nd series), vol. ii; also in Venetian Calendar, vol. vi, part ii, 1043–1085.] 3. **Navagero, Card. M. Bernardo,** Relazione alla Ser^{ma} Rep^{ca} di Venezia tornando di Roma Ambasciatore appresso del Pontefice Paolo IV. 1858. 4. **Noailles,** Ambassades de Messieurs de, en Angleterre. Ed. l'Abbé Vertot. 5 tomes. Leyden. 1763. Of these letters the originals are partly preserved in Brussels and partly no longer to be found. Transcripts however are in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris as follows: Archives des affaires étrangères, mémoires et documents, fonds divers, 14 (Angleterre, 12), 1553–1557. Copie du journal des voyages de François de Noailles en Angleterre, pendant l'ambassade de son frère Antoine de Noailles. Extraits et analyses des documents de la Correspondance politique d'Angleterre pendant les ambassades d'Antoine de Noailles (mai 1553–mai 1556), Gilles de Noailles (mai–nov. 1556), François de Noailles (oct. 1556–juill. 1557), par de Valincourt. 15 (Angleterre, 13) 1556–1560. Recueil de copies de documents relatifs à l'Écosse: lettres des ambassadeurs de France en Angleterre, etc. According to P. Friedmann, not more than a fourth part of the Noailles correspondence is included in the volumes published by the Abbé de Vertot. [Thirty volumes of the correspondence of this celebrated family of diplomatists, formerly preserved in the library of the Louvre, were burnt in 1871. See Louis Paris, Les Papiers des Noailles de la Bibliothèque du Louvre. Paris. 1875.] 5. **Renard, Simon,** Letters to and from the Emperor Charles V. Printed in Papiers d'État du Cardinal de Granvelle. Vols. 3 and 4 Publiés sous la direction de M. Ch. Weiss. Paris. Imprimerie Royale. 1841. The originals are in the public library at Besançon. Of these, some of which are not included in the volumes edited by Weiss, a complete enumeration is given by M. A. Caston in Catalogue Générale des Manuscrits des Bibliothèques publiques de France, *Départements*, vol. xxxiii. The letters included by Weiss are distinguished by a W. Other correspondence of Renard and Jean Schyfre was formerly preserved in the Archives du Royaume de Belgique in Brussels, but has partly disappeared. Transcripts of the portion 20 Feb. 1553 to 15 June 1554 are, however, in the Record Office Transcripts (Sect. ii, vols. 145, 146), and were used both by Tytler and Froude.

D. Collections of Private Letters.

Copia d' una Lettera d'Angleterra, nella quale narra l' entrata dell' Card. Polo in Inghilterra per la conversione di quella Isola alla Fede Catholica. Milan. 1554.

Poli Epistolae. 5 vols. Brescia. 1744–57.

E. Contemporary Chronicles, Tracts, etc.

Accession (the) of Queen Mary: being the contemporary Narrative of Antonio de Guaras, a Spanish Merchant resident in London. Edited with an Introduction, Translation, Notes and an Appendix of Documents, including a contemporary Ballad in Fac-simile, by R. Garnett. London. 1892.

Annales, or A General Chronicle of England. Begun by John Stow and augmented with Matters forraigne and domestique, ancient and moderne, unto the end of the present yeere 1631. By Edmund Howes, Gent. London. 1631.
Chronicle of the Grey Friars. Edited by J. G. Nichols. Camden Society. 1852.
Chronicle of Queen Jane and of Two Years of Queen Mary and especially of the Rebellion of Sir Thomas Wyat, written by a Resident in the Tower of London. Ed. by J. G. Nichols. Camden Society. 1850. [The 'Resident' was probably one Rowland Lea.]
Florebellus, Ant., Mutinensis, ad Philippum et Mariam reges de restituta in Anglia Religione Oratio. Lovanii. 1555. [Floribelli was bishop of Lavello.]
Guidus, Ant. Oratio in funere Mariae Brittaniae Reginae ad Cardinales Regumque Rerumpublicarum Legatos Romae habita viii ante Idus Mart 1559. Romae, ex Officina Salviana, 1559.
Grafton, Ri. Chronicle at large and meere History of the Affayres of Englande. Ed. Sir H. Ellis. London. 1809.
Gray, G. J. General Index to Hazlitt's Handbook of Bibliographical Collections (London, 1893), pp. 494 and 597.
Journey of the Queen's Ambassadors to Rome, anno 1555. Hardwicke State Papers. Vol. i.
The Primer in Latin and English (after the Use of Sarum) with many godlye and devoute Prayers....Where unto is added a playne and godlye treatise concerning the Masse. John Waylande. London. 1555.
Proctor, Jo., Historie of Wyates Rebellion. Printed in Grosse's Antiquarian Repertory, iii, 65–115. London. 1808. [The narrative of a strong Romanist.]
Rosso, Giuglio Baviglio. I successi d' Inghilterra dopo la morte di Odoardo VI fino alla giunta in quel regno di Don Filippo d' Austria, princ. di Spagna. Ferrara. 1560. [The Venetian edition of 1558 (which is that used by Froude) is mutilated and does not bear the writer's name.]

Biographies.

Beccadeli, Ludovico. The Life of Cardinal Reginald Pole, written originally in Italian, translated into English with Notes critical and historical. By B. Pye. London. 1776. [Beccadelli, or Beccatelli, was Pole's secretary.]
Carew, Sir Peter, Life of, by John Hooker (or Vowell). Edited by Sir John Maclean. London. 1857.
Dormer, Jane, Duchess of Feria, Life of [by Henry Clifford, her Secretary]. Edited by Estcourt and Stevenson. London. 1887.
Hoby, Sir Thos. Travel and Life of (1547–1564), written by himself. Camden Miscellany. Vol. x.

Education.

1. Letter of Queen Mary to the bishopp of Winchester, chancellor of our University of Cambridge, 20 Aug. 1553. 2. Mere, J., Queen Mary's Visitation [of the Univerrity of Cambridge], Nov. 1556. 3. Ordinationes Reginaldi Poli pro Regimine Universitatis, item pro Directione et salubri Regimine Collegiorum, Aularum seu Domorum ejusdem Universitatis Cantabr. 21 Nov. 1557. The foregoing all in Lamb, J., Collection of Letters, Statutes and other Documents from the MS. Library of Corpus Christi College. London. 1838.

SECONDARY AUTHORITIES.

General.

Armstrong, E. The Emperor Charles V. 2 vols. London. 1902.

Brosch, M. Geschichte von England. Vol. vi. Gotha. 1890.

Castelnau, Mich., de Mauvissière. Mémoires. Ed. J. le Laboureur. Brussels. 1731.

Druffel, A. von. Briefe und Akten zur Gesch. des 16 Jahrhunderts. 4 vols. 1873–96 (vol. iv).

Forneron, H. Histoire de Philippe II. 2 vols. Paris. 1881.

Friedmann, P. New Facts in the History of Mary, Queen of England. Macmillan's Mag. xix, 1–12.

Griffet, H. Nouveaux éclaircissements sur l'histoire de Marie, reine d'Angleterre. Paris. 1776.

Henne, Alexandre. Histoire du règne de Charles-Quint en Belgique. 4 vols. Brussels. 1866.

Heylyn, Jo. Examen Historicum, or Discovery and Examination of the Mistakes, Falsities and Defects in some Modern Histories. London. 1659.

Motley, J. R. Rise of the Dutch Republic. Vol. i. London. 1855.

Ranke, L. von. Die römischen Papste. Vol. i. Vol. xxxvii of Sämmtliche Werke. Leipzig. 1874 etc.

Relations politiques des Pays-Bas et de l'Angleterre sous le règne de Philippe II, publiées par M. le Baron de Lettenhove. 10 vols. Vol. i.: Depuis l'Abdication de Charles-Quint jusqu'au Départ de Philippe II pour l'Espagne (25 oct. 1555—24 août 1559). Brussels. 1882.

Stone, J. M. History of Mary I, Queen of England. London. 1901.

Wiesener, L. The Youth of Queen Elizabeth (1533–1558). 2 vols. English Translation. London. 1879.

Zimmermann, A. Marie die Katholische. Freiburg i. B. 1890.

Biographical.

Duruy, G. Le Cardinal Carlo Caraffa. Paris. 1882.

Freeman, E. A. Cardinal Pole. Essays, 4th Series. (First published in Sat. Rev. 1869.)

Graziani, Ant. Maria, bishop of Amelia. De Vita I. F. Commendoria, Cardinalis, Libri iv. Paris. 1669. French translation by Fléchier. Paris. 1694.

Hook, W. F. (Dean). Lives of Cranmer and Pole in Archbishops of Canterbury. N. S. Vols. ii, iii. London. 1868, 1869.

Hume, M. A. S. Visit of Philip II (1554). English Hist. Review. 1892.

Lee, F. G. Reginald Pole, Cardinal Archbishop of Canterbury. London. 1888.

Madden, Sir F. Privy Purse Expenses of Princess Mary, with Memoir and Notes. London. 1831.

Phillips, Thos. History of the Life of Cardinal Pole. Oxford. 1764.

Pope, Sir Thos. Life of, by Thomas Wharton. London. 1772. (See also Life in D. N. B. and English Hist. Review, xi, 282–.)

Zimmermann, A. Kardinal Pole, sein Leben und seine Schriften. Ratisbon. 1893.

Special Subjects.

Creighton, C. History of Epidemics in Britain. Cambridge. 1891.

Leadam, I. S. Narrative of the Pursuit of the English Refugees in Germany under Queen Mary. Trans. of Royal Historical Society. 1896.

Verney Family, Letters and Papers of the, edited by J. Bruce. Camden Society. 1853. [Important for the Dudley Conspiracy.]

CHAPTER XVI.

THE ANGLICAN SETTLEMENT AND THE SCOTTISH REFORMATION.

The chief bibliographical works concerning this period of British history are (1) J. Scott's Bibliography of Works relating to Mary Queen of Scots, 1544–1700 (printed for the Edinburgh Bibliographical Soc., 1896), and (2) H. M. Dexter's Congregationalism (for which see below under II. B.). Catalogues of early printed books in the great libraries give some assistance.

The principal manuscript materials in England that have not yet been printed or adequately abstracted in Calendars are the State Papers, Domestic, at the Record Office. There are a few volumes at the British Museum containing State Papers, to which the class catalogue in the MS. Room serves as a guide. The Parker MSS. at Corpus Christi Coll Camb. have been much used by historians and publishers of documents, but a full calendar is a desideratum.

I. GENERAL HISTORY OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

A. Records, State Papers, and Letters.

Acts of the Parliament of Scotland (Official ed.). Vol. II. 1814.
Acts of the [English] Privy Council, vol. VII (1558–70). London. 1893.
Anderson, J. Collections relating to the History of Mary Queen of Scots. Edinburgh. 1727–8.
Beale, R. Argument touching the validity of the marriage of Charles Brandon. In MS. Camb. Univ., Dd. iii. 85. [See Dict. Nat. Biog. IV, 6]
Birrel, R. Diary. Fragments of Scotch History, ed. J. G. Dalyell. Edinburgh. 1798.
Browne, A., and Bacon, N. Tracts on the Succession to the Crown. In Booth, N., The Right of Succession to the Crown. 1723.
Castelnau, M. de. Mémoires. Ed. J. le Laboureur, Bruxelles, 1731. (1st ed. Paris, 1660)
Correspondencia de Felipe II. Documentos inéditos para la Historia de España, ed. Navarrete and others Vol. LXXXVII. Madrid. 1886.
Dewes, Simonds. Journal of the Parliaments of Queen Elizabeth. London. 1682.
Diurnal of Remarkable Occurrents. Bannatyne Club. 1833.
Doleman, R. [i.e. Parsons, R.]. A Conference about the next Succession to the Crown. [St Omer.] 1594.
Dyson, H. Queene Elizabeth's Proclamations, 1618. (Brit. Mus. Grenv. 6463.)
Egerton Papers. Camden Soc. London. 1840.
Ellis, H. Original Letters, 1st Ser., vol. II; 2nd Ser., vol. II; 3rd Ser., vol. III. London. 1824–46.

Exchequer Rolls of Scotland. Vols. xviii, xix. Edinburgh. 1898.
Ferrière, H. de la. Lettres de Catherine de Médicis. Vol. i. Paris. 1880.
Forbes, P. Full View of the Public Transactions in the Reign of Elizabeth. 2 vols. London. 1740–1.
Froude, J. A. Spanish Transcripts. Brit. Mus. MS. Addit. 26056.
Gachard, L. P. Correspondance de Marguerite d'Autriche. Vol. i. Brussels. 1867.
—— Correspondance de Philippe II. Vols. i, ii. Brussels. 1848–61.
Gonsalez, T. Documents from Simancas. Transl. S. Hall. London. 1865.
Hales, J. Declaration of the Succession of the Crown, 1563. In [Harbin, G.] Hereditary Right of the Crown. London. 1713.
Hamilton MSS. Eleventh Rep. of Hist. MSS. Com. App vi. London. 1887.
Hamilton Papers. Vols. i, ii. Edinburgh. 1890–2.
Hardwicke, Philip, Earl of. Miscellaneous State Papers. Vol. i. London. 1778.
Haynes, S. Burghley State Papers. London. 1740.
Journal of the House of Commons (Official ed.). Vol. i, no date.
Journal of the House of Lords (Official ed.). Vol. i, no date.
Keith, R. History of the Affairs of Church and State in Scotland. Spottiswoode Soc. Edinburgh. 1844. (1st ed. Edinburgh, 1734.)
Kervyn de Lettenhove. Relations politiques des Pays-Bas et de l'Angleterre. Vols. i–iii. Brussels. 1882–3.
Labanoff, A. Lettres inédites de Marie Stuart. Paris. 1839.
—— Lettres, instructions et mémoires de Marie Stuart. London. 1844.
Languet, Hubert. Epistolae. Halle. 1699.
Leicester's Commonwealth. [London.] 1641. [Erroneously attributed to Parsons the Jesuit. For its history see Dict. Nat. Biog. xvi, 121.]
Members of Parliament, Returns. Part i. Blue book, 1878.
Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland, 1560–72. Hist. Com. d. Akad. d. Wissensch. Vienna. 1897.
Paris, L. Négotiations...relatives au règne de François II. Paris. 1841.
Pollen, J H. Papal Negotiations with Mary Queen of Scots. Scot. Hist. Soc. Edinburgh. 1901.
Prothero, G. W. Select Statutes and other Constitutional Documents. London. 1894.
Register of the Great Seal of Scotland (1546–80). Edinburgh. 1886
Register of the Privy Council of Scotland. Vol. i (1545–69). Edinburgh. 1877.
'Roman Transcripts.' MS. at Record Office. [Copies made in various Roman Archives.]
Rutland Manuscripts. Hist. MSS Com. Rep xii, App. 4. London. 1888.
Rymer, T. Foedera. Vol. xv. London. 1713.
State Papers. Borders of England and Scotland. Calendar. Vol. i. Edinburgh. 1894.
State Papers, Domestic. MS. at Record Office. [The published Calendar, Vols. i and vii, merely indicates the nature of the documents.]
State Papers, Foreign. Elizabeth. Calendar. Vols. i–vi. London. 1863–9.
State Papers. Hatfield or Cecil MSS. Calendar. Vol. i. London. 1883, repr. 1895.
State Papers of Sir Ralph Sadler, ed. Clifford. Edinburgh. 1809.
State Papers. Scotland and Mary Queen of Scots. Calendar. Vol. i. Edinburgh. 1898.
State Papers, Spanish (1558–67). Calendar. London. 1892.
State Papers, Venetian. Calendar. Vol. viii. London. 1890.
Statutes of the Realm (Official ed.). Vol. iv. 1819 [The original Acts of Parliament preserved in the Parliament Office sometimes supply a little additional information.]
Stevenson, J. Selections from manuscripts relating to Mary Queen of Scots. Maitland Club. Edinburgh. 1837.

Teulet, A. Papiers d'état...relatifs à l'histoire de l'Écosse. Bannatyne Club. Paris. 1851.
—— Relations politiques de la France et de l'Espagne avec l'Écosse. Paris. 1862.
Turba, G. Venetianische Depeschen vom Kaiserhofe. Vol. III. Vienna. 1895.
Strickland, A. Letters of Mary Queen of Scots. London. 1842.
Weiss, C. Papiers d'état du Cardinal Granvelle. Vols. IV–VI. Paris. 1843–6.
Wright, T. Queen Elizabeth and her Times. London. 1838.

B. Chronicles and Early Histories.

Beaugué, J. de. L'histoire de la Guerre d'Escosse. Maitland Club. Edinburgh. 1830. Another edition, Bordeaux, 1862.
Brantôme. Œuvres complètes. Ed. L. Lalanne. Paris. 1864–82.
Buchanan, George. Rerum Scoticarum Historia. Edinburgh. 1583.
Burghley, Life of. In F. Peck, Desiderata Curiosa. London. 1779. (1st ed. in 1732.)
Camden, W. Annales. London. 1615.
Complaynt, the, of Scotlande, 1549. Early Eng. Text Soc. London. 1872.
Conaeus, G. Vita Mariae Stuartae. Wurzburg and Rome. 1624.
Condé, Mémoires de. The Hague. 1743.
Hayward, J. Annals of Queen Elizabeth. Camden Soc. London. 1840.
Herries, Lord. Historical Memoirs. Abbotsford Club. Edinburgh. 1836.
Holinshed, R. Chronicle. London. 1586-7. [As to the rare first edition, see Dict. Nat. Biog XXVII, 131.]
Jebb, S. De vita et rebus gestis Mariae...quae scriptis tradidere auctores sedecim. London. 1725.
[Lesley, J.] A defence of the Honour of...Marie, Queene of Scotland. London. 1569. [See Scott, Bibliography, pp. 20, 23]
Lesley, J. De origine...Scotorum. Romae. 1578.
—— History of Scotland. Scot. Text Soc. Edinburgh. 1888.
Lyndsay of Pitscottie Historie of Scotland. Scot. Text Soc. Edinburgh. 1899.
Machyn's Diary. Camden Soc. London. 1844. [See Eng. Hist. Rev. XI, 282.]
Maitland, J. Narrative of the Principal Acts of the Regency. Edinburgh. 1822.
Melville, James. Memoirs. Bannatyne Club. Edinburgh. 1827. (Maitland Club.) Edinburgh. 1833. (1st ed. 1683)
Naunton, R. Fragmenta Regalia. London. 1641. [For the various editions, see Dict. Nat. Biog. XL, 128]
Nichols, J. Progresses of Queen Elizabeth London. 1823. [Vol. I, p. 60: Coronation Service.]
Stow, J. Annales of England. London. 1605. (1st ed. 1592.)
—— Memoranda. Three Fifteenth Century Chronicles. Camden Soc. London. 1880.
Wriothesley, C. Chronicle. Camden Soc. London. 1875.

C. Modern Works.

Beesley, E. S. Queen Elizabeth. London. 1892.
Bekker, E. Beitrage zur englischen Geschichte im Zeitalter Elisabeths. Giessen. 1887. Elisabeth und Leicester. Giessen. 1890.
Broech, M. Habsburgische Vermälungspläne mit Elisabeth. Mitth. d. Instituts für osterreich. Geschichtsforschung. x, 121. Innsbruck. 1889.
Brown, P. Hume. History of Scotland. Vols. I, II. Cambridge. 1899–1902.
Brugmans, H. Engeland en de Nederlanden, 1558–67. Groningen. 1892.
Burton, J. H. History of Scotland. Ed. 2. Edinburgh. 1873.

Chalmers, G. Life of Mary Queen of Scots. London. 1818.
Creighton, M. (Bishop). Queen Elizabeth. London. 1896.
Cunningham, W. Growth of English Industry and Commerce in Modern Times. Cambridge, 1903, pp. 127–137. [The recoinage of 1561.]
Duruy, G. Le Cardinal Carlo Caraffa. Paris. 1882.
Fleming, D. Hay. Mary Queen of Scots from her birth until her flight into England. London. 1897.
Forneron, H. Les ducs de Guise et leur époque. Paris. 1877.
—— Histoire de Philippe II. Paris. 1881.
Froude, J. A. History of England. Reign of Elizabeth. London. 1864.
Gairdner, J. The Death of Amy Robsart. Eng. Hist. Rev. I, 235; XIII, 83.
Hallam, H. Constitutional History of England. London. 1832.
Henderson, T. F. Lives of Mary Stuart, Douglas (Lady Margaret), Hamilton (James, 3rd Earl of Arran), Maitland (William), Stewart (Lord James), Stewart (Matthew, Earl of Lennox) in Dict. Nat. Biog.
Hosack, J. Mary Queen of Scots and her Accusers. Ed. 2. Edinburgh. 1870.
Hume, M. A. The Courtships of Queen Elizabeth. London. 1896.
—— The great Lord Burghley. London. 1898.
Lang, A. History of Scotland. Vols. I, II. Edinburgh. 1900–2.
—— Scandal about Queen Elizabeth. [Amy Robsart.] Blackwood's Magazine, CLIII, 209. Edinburgh. 1893.
Lee, S. L. Life of Robert Dudley. In Dict. Nat. Biog. XVI, 112 [for death of Lady Robert, with bibliography].
Lingard, J. History of England. Ed. 6. London. 1854.
Marcks, E. Konigin Elisabeth. Bielefeld. 1897.
Mathieson, W. L. Politics and Religion in Scotland. Glasgow. 1902.
Maurenbrecher, W. Beitrage zur Geschichte Maximilians II. Hist. Zeitschrift, vol. XXXII (1874), pp. 221, 277.
Mignet, F. A. M. Histoire de Marie Stuart. Ed. 6. Paris. 1885.
Müller, T. Das Konklave Pius IV. Gotha. 1889.
Nares, E. Memoirs of Lord Burghley. London. 1823–38.
Paillard, C. La conjuration d'Amboise Revue historique. Vol. XIV (1880), pp. 61, 311.
Philippson, M. La contra-révolution religieuse. Bruxelles. 1884.
—— Histoire du règne de Marie Stuart. Paris. 1891–2.
Pollen, J. H. Papers published in 'The Month,' 1900–2, and in Dublin Review, Jan. 1903.
Rait, R. S. The Scottish Parliament. London. 1901.
—— Relations between England and Scotland. London. 1901.
Ranke, L. v. Englische Geschichte. Vol. XIV of Sammtliche Werke. Berlin. 1874, etc.
Reimann, E. Der Streit zwischen Papstthum und Kaiserthum im Jahre 1558. Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte. Vol. V, p. 291. Gottingen. 1865.
Ritter, M. Deutsche Geschichte im Zeitalter der Gegenreformation. Vol. I. Stuttgart. 1889.
Rogers, J. E. T. History of Agriculture and Prices. Vol. IV, pp. 197 ff. [The recoinage of 1561.] Oxford. 1882.
Ruble, A. de. Antoine de Bourbon et Jeanne d'Albret. Paris. 1881–2.
—— Le traité de Cateau-Cambrésis. Paris. 1889.
—— La première jeunesse de Marie Stuart. Paris. 1891.
Rye, W. The Murder of Amy Robsart. London. 1885.
Schlossberger, A. Verhandlungen über die beabsichtigte Vermählung des Erzherzogs Karl mit der Konigin Elizabeth. Forschungen zur deutschen Geschichte. Vol. V, p. 1. Göttingen. 1865.

Skelton, J. Maitland of Lethington. Ed. 2. Edinburgh. 1894.
Storm, G. Maria Stuart. Uebersetzt von P. Wittmann. Munich. 1896.
Swinburne, A. C. Mary Queen of Scots. Encyclop. Britan. Vol. xv. Edinburgh. 1883.
Tait, J. Life of Mary of Guise in Dict. Nat. Biog.
Tytler, P. F. History of Scotland. London. 1876.
Voss, W. Die Verhandlungen Pius IV mit den katholischen Mächten. Leipzig. 1887.
Wertheimer, E. Heirathsverhandlungen zwischen Elizabeth und Erzherzog Karl. Hist. Zeitschrift. Vol. XL (1878), p. 385.
Wiesener, L. The Youth of Queen Elizabeth. Engl. Transl. London. 1879.
Wolf, G. Zur Geschichte der deutschen Protestanten, 1555–9. Berlin. 1888.

II. ECCLESIASTICAL AFFAIRS OF ENGLAND AND SCOTLAND.

A. Primary Materials.

Bateson, M. A collection of Original Letters from the Bishops to the Privy Council, 1564. Camden Miscellany. Vol. ix. London. 1893.
Book of the Universal Kirk. Vol. i. Bannatyne Club. Edinburgh. 1839.
Beza, T. Tractatus pius...de vera excommunicatione. London. 1590.
Bullarium Romanum. Luxemb. 1727. Vol. i, p. 840. [Bull of 15 Feb. 1559.] Vol. ii, p. 324. [Bull deposing Elizabeth.]
Bullinger, H. Bullae papisticae...contra...Angliae Reginam Elizabetham...defensio. London. 1571.
Bucholtz, F. B. v. Geschichte der Regierung Ferdinand des Ersten. Vienna. 1831-8. Vol. ix, pp. 699–702.
Calderwood, D. History of the Kirk of Scotland. Woodrow Soc. Edinburgh. 1842–9. (1st ed. 1678.)
[Calvin's Letters.] Thesaurus Epistolicus Calvinianus. Brunswick. 1872–9. (Corpus Reformatorum, ed. Baum, Cunitz, Reuss. Vols xxxviii–xlviii.)
Cardwell, E. Documentary Annals of the Church of England. Oxford. 1839.
—— History of Conferences. Oxford. 1840.
—— Synodalia. Oxford. 1842.
Catholic Tractates of the Sixteenth Century. Ed. T. G. Law. Scot. Text Soc. Edinburgh. 1901.
[**Clerke, B.**] Fidelis servi subdito infideli responsio. London. 1573.
Coke, Sir E. Fourth Institute, 324 ff. [Headship of Church and High Commission.] London. 1797. (1st ed. 1644.)
Confession (The), of the faythe and doctrine beleued and professed by the Protestantes of the Realm of Scotlande. London. 1561.
Dyer, Sir J. Reports, fo. 234, plac. 15. London. 1632. [Bonner's case: see also Curia Regis Rolls, no 1212, Roll 13 at Record Office.]
Erastus, T. Explicatio gravissimae quaestionis, utrum excommunicatio, etc. Pesclavii [= London]. 1589.
Forbes-Leith, W. Narratives of Scottish Catholics. Edinburgh. 1885.
Fox, J. Acts and Monuments. London. 1844–9. [For early editions, see Dict. Nat. Biog., vol xx, p. 147.]
Gude and Godlie Ballatis. Ed. A. F. Mitchell. Scot. Text Soc. Edinburgh. 1897.
Heppe, H. The Reformers of England and Germany. Engl. Transl. London. 1859.
Hessels, J. H. Ecclesiae Londino-Batavae Archivum. Vol. i. Cambridge. 1887.
Hospinianus, R. Concordia discors. Geneva. 1678.
Jewel, J. Works. Parker Soc. Cambridge. 1845–50.
Kausler, E. v., und Schott, T. Briefwechsel zwischen Cristoph, Herzog v. Württemberg, und P. P. Vergerius. Tubingen. 1875.

Knox, J. Works. Ed. D. Laing. Edinburgh. 1846–55; and for Bannatyne C Edinburgh. 1855–64.
Law, T. G. Abp. Hamilton's Catechism. Oxford. 1884.
Le Plat, J. Monumentorum ad historiam Concilii Tridentini...Collectio. Vol pp. 272–3. Lovanii. 1781–7.
Liturgies set forth in the Reign of Elizabeth. Ed. Clay. Parker Soc. Cambri 1847.
Lyndsay, Sir David. Poetical Works. Ed. Laing. Edinburgh. 1879.
Morus, H. Historia Provinciae Anglicanae Societatis Jesu. St Omer. 1660.
Müller, E. F. Karl. Die Bekenntnisschriften der reformierten Kirche. Leipzig. 1
Nowell, A. Sermon before Parliament. MS. Caius Coll 64.
Pallavicino, S. Vera Concilii Tridentini Historia. Antwerp. 1670. Vol. ii, p.
Parker, M. Correspondence. Parker Soc. Cambridge. 1853
Parker Society's Publications. General Index. Cambridge. 1855.
Reformatio Legum, ed. Cardwell. Oxford. 1850
Ribier, G. Lettres et mémoires Paris. 1677. Vol. ii, p. 776.
Robertson, J. Statuta Ecclesiae Scotticanae. Bannatyne Club. Edinburgh]
Sanders, N. MS. Report to Cardinal Morone of the change of religion in Eng Copy among 'Roman Transcripts' at the Record Office.
—— De visibili Monarchia Ecclesiae. Louvain. 1571.
—— De origine...Schismatis Anglicani. Edited and continued by E. Risl Cologne. 1585.
Saravia, H. De diversis gradibus ministrorum. London. 1590.
Sarpi, P. Histoire du Concile de Trente. Transl P. F. le Courayer. Amster 1736. Vol. ii, p. 52.
Schaff, P. The Creeds of the Evangelical Protestant Churches. London. 18
Schickler, F. de. Les églises de refuge en Angleterre. Paris. 1892.
Scott, Hew. Fasti Ecclesiae Scoticanae. Edinburgh. 1866–71.
Sickel, T. Zur Geschichte des Concils von Trient. Vienna. 1872.
Somers Tracts. Ed. by Sir W. Scott. Vol. i, pp. 61–85, 163–174, 189- London. 1809.
Sparrow, A. A collection of Articles, Injunctions, etc. London. 1675.
Spottiswoode, J. History of the Church and State of Scotland Spottiswoode Edinburgh. 1851. (1st ed London, 1655.)
Strype, J. Annals of the Reformation. Oxford. 1824.
—— Lives of Parker, Grindal, Whitgift, Cheke, Smith, Aylmer. Oxford. 18 [For earlier editions, see Dict. Nat. Biog LV, 69.]
Whitgift, J. Works. Parker Soc. Cambridge. 1851–3.
[Whittingham, W.] A Brieff Discours' off the Troubles begonne at Franck 1575. Reprinted, 1846.
—— Life of, in Camden Miscellany. Vol. vi. London. 1870.
Wilkins, D. Concilia. Vol. iv. London. 1737.
Winzet, N. Certain Tractates. Scot. Text Soc. Edinburgh. 1888–90.
Zurich Letters (Epistolae Tigurinae). Two Series. Parker Soc. Cambridge. 18
Controversial Tracts. The titles of the most important may be found in Dict. Biog. In the first years of the reign the chief Anglican apologists are John J and Alexander Nowell. For the Roman side see the lives of Henry Thomas Dorman, Thomas Harding, James Harpsfield, Nicholas Harps Alban Langdale, John Rastell, Thomas Stapleton: also of William A Robert Parsons, Nicholas Sanders. The first stages of the Puritan develop are to be found rather in letters, episcopal injunctions, etc., than in tracts. see the lives of Matthew Parker and other Elizabethan bishops of the generation; also those of Thomas Cartwright, Anthony Gilby, John Christopher Goodman, Laurence Humphrey, Thomas Lever, Thomas Sam and William Whittingham.

B. Modern Works.

Bailey, T. J. Ordinum Sacrorum in Ecclesia Anglicana Defensio. London. 1870.
Bellesheim, A. History of the Catholic Church of Scotland. Trans. O. H. Blair. Edinburgh. 1887.
Benrath, K. Bernardino Ochino. Leipzig. 1875.
Bonnard, A. Thomas Eraste. Lausanne. 1894.
Bridgett, T. E. Blunders and Forgeries. London. 1890. [Ware's forgeries.]
Bridgett, T. E., and Knox, T. F. The true story of the Catholic Hierarchy. London. 1889.
Brown, P. Hume. John Knox. London. 1895.
—— George Buchanan. Edinburgh. 1890.
Burnet, G. History of the Reformation. Ed. Pocock. Oxford. 1865. (1st ed. 1678–1714.)
Churton, R. Life of Alexander Nowell. Oxford 1809.
Collier, J. Ecclesiastical History. Ed. Barham. London. 1840-1. (1st ed. 1708–14.)
Creighton, M. (Bishop). The Excommunication of Queen Elizabeth. Eng. Hist. Rev. VII, 81.
Cunningham, J. The Church History of Scotland. Edinburgh. 1882.
Denny, E., and Lacey, T. A. De Hierarchia Anglicana. London. 1895. Supplementum. Romae. 1896.
Dimock, N. Dangerous Deceits. London. 1895.
—— Vox Liturgiae Anglicanae London. 1897.
Dexter, H. M. Congregationalism as seen in its Literature. New York. 1880. [Valuable bibliography.]
Dixon, R. W. History of the Church of England. London. 1878–1902.
Dodd, C. Church History of England. Ed Tierney. London. 1839–43.
Dorner, I A. Geschichte der protestantischen Theologie. Munich. 1867.
Dugdale, H. G. Life of Edmund Geste. London. 1840.
Estcourt, E. E The Question of Anglican Ordinations. London. 1873.
Figgis, J. N. Erastus and Erastianism. Journ. of Theol. Studies, II, 66. London. 1901.
Forbes-Leith, J. La révolution religieuse en Angleterre. Revue des quest. hist., LVIII, 456. Paris. 1895.
Fuller, T. The Church History of Britain Ed. Brewer. Oxford. 1845. (1st ed. 1655.)
Gee, H. The Elizabethan Clergy. Oxford. 1898.
—— The Elizabethan Prayer-Book and Ornaments. London. 1902.
Gibson, E. C. S. The Thirty-Nine Articles. Ed. 2. London. 1898.
Grub, G. Ecclesiastical History of Scotland. Edinburgh. 1861.
Hardwick, C. History of the Articles of Religion. Cambridge. 1859.
Heylin, P. Ecclesia Restaurata. Ed. Robertson. Cambridge, 1849. (1st ed. 1661.)
Jacobs, H. E. The Lutheran Movement in England. Philadelphia. 1891.
Kluckhohn, A. Friedrich der Fromme. Nordlingen. 1879.
Kugler, B. Christoph, Herzog zu Wirtemberg. Stuttgart. 1868.
Kurtz, J. H. Church History. Engl. Transl. London. 1888.
Lamb, J. Historical Account of the Thirty-Nine Articles. Cambridge. 1829.
Laurence, R. Bampton Lectures for 1804. Ed. 3. Oxford. 1838.
Lechler, G. V. Geschichte der Presbyterial- und Synodalverfassung. 1854.
Lee, F. G. The Church under Elizabeth. London. 1892.
Lorimer, P. Life of Patrick Hamilton. Edinburgh. 1857.
—— John Knox and the Church of England. London. 1875.
MCrie, T. Life of Knox. Ed. Crichton. Edinburgh. 1840. (1st ed. 1812.)

MacColl, M. Lawlessness, Sacerdotalism, and Ritualism. Ed. 3. London. 1875.
—— The Reformation Settlement. Ed. 10. London. 1901.
Mackay, Æ. Lives of Hamilton (Patrick), Knox (John), Lindsay (David) in Dict. Nat. Biog.
Maitland, F. W. Elizabethan Gleanings. Eng. Hist. Rev. xv, 120, 324, 530, 757.
Maxwell, A. The History of Old Dundee. Edinburgh. 1891, pp. 81 ff. [George Wishart.]
Micklethwaite, J. T. The Ornaments of the Rubric. Alcuin Club Tracts. London. 1897.
Mitchell, A. F. The Scottish Reformation. Edinburgh. 1900.
Mullinger, J. B. History of the University of Cambridge from the Royal Injunctions of 1535. Cambridge. 1884.
Neal, D. History of the Puritans. London. 1754.
Parker, J. The Ornaments Rubrick. Oxford. 1881.
—— Did Queen Elizabeth take other order? Oxford. 1878.
Perry, G. G. History of the English Church. Second Period. Ed. 6 London. 1900.
Perry, T. W. The Declaration on Kneeling. London. 1863.
Pestalozzi, C. Heinrich Bullinger. Elberfeld. 1858.
Pocock, N. The Reformation Settlement of the English Church. Eng. Hist. Rev. I, 677.
—— Condition of Morals and Religious Belief in the Reign of Edward VI. Eng. Hist. Rev. x, 417.
Preger, W. Matthias Flacius Illyricus. Erlangen. 1859. [Adiaphorist controversy.]
Procter, F. History of the Book of Common Prayer. Ed. W. H. Frere. London. 1902.
Pullan, L. History of the Book of Common Prayer. Ed 3. London. 1901.
Rigg, J. M. Life of Bernardino Ochino in Dict. Nat. Biog.
Ruble, A. de. Le colloque de Poissy. Paris. 1889.
Sage, Bp J. Works. Spottiswoode Soc. Edinburgh. 1844–6.
Schaff, P. History of the Creeds of Christendom. London. 1877.
Shaw, W. A. Elizabethan Presbyterianism. Eng Hist. Rev. III, 655.
Simpson, R. Edmund Campion. London. 1896.
[Simpson, R. (?)]. Parpaglia's Mission to Elizabeth. North British Review. London. (1870) Vol. LII, p. 366
Stephen, W. History of the Scottish Church. Edinburgh. 1894–6.
Swainson, C. A. In the Advertisements of 1566 was order taken, etc.? Cambridge. 1880.
—— An Essay on the History of Article XXIX. Cambridge. 1856
Tomlinson, J. T. The Prayer Book, Articles, and Homilies. London. 1897.
Waddington, J. Congregational History, 1200–1567. London. 1869.

Arguments and judgments in various modern lawsuits: see Digests to 'The Law Reports' under 'Ecclesiastical Law': especially Sheppard *v.* Bennett (3 A. and E. 167; 4 P. C. 371); Hebbert *v.* Purchas (3 P. C. 605); Ridsdale *v.* Clifton (2 P. D. 276); Read *v.* Bp of Lincoln (1891 P. 9; 1892 A. C. 644).

NOTE.

Of the books mentioned under this last head some may be considerod as classical. Others have been selected out of a vast number as recent representatives of the various parties and schools which comment on the religious changes made in the period (1558–63) treated in Chapter XVI.

CHAPTER XVII.

THE SCANDINAVIAN NORTH.

PUBLISHED DOCUMENTS.

Aarsberetninger fra det [Danske] K. Geheime-Archivet. Edd. C. F. Wegener etc. Copenhagen. 1855 f

Aktstykker til Nordens Historie i Grevefeidens Tid. Ed. C. Paludan-Müller. 2 vols. Odense. 1852–3.

Allen, C. F. Briefe og Aktstykker til Oplysning af Christiern II og Frederik I's Historie. I. Copenhagen. 1854.

Altes und Neues von Gelehrten Sachen aus Dannemark. 3 vols. Copenhagen and Leipzig. 1768

Andersson, A. Skrifter fran Reformationstiden. (Skrifter utgifna af Svenska Literatursällskapet) Upsala 1889 f

Bang, A. C. Den Norske Kirkes symbolske Boger Christiania. 1889.

Brask, J. Epistolae. (Handlingar rorande Sveriges Historia XIII—XVIII.) Stockholm. 1861 f

Bugenhagen, J. Briefswechsel. Ed. O. Vogt. Stettin. 1888.

Bullarium Romano-Sueo-Gothicum. Ed. Magnus a Celse. Stockholm. 1782.

Christiern II's Arkiv. Handlingar rorande Severin Norby. Ed. N. J. Ekdahl. 4 vols Stockholm. 1835–42.

Danische Bibliothek (ed. Herbò Langebek and Moeller) Vols. I–IX. Copenhagen and Leipzig. 1738–43.

Danske Magazin. 6 vols. Copenhagen. 1745–52.—Nye Danske Magazin. 6 vols. 1794–1836.—Danske Magazin. Ser. III. 6 vols. 1843–60.—Ditto. Ser. IV. 1861 f.

Danske Samlinger. Ed. C. Bruun etc. Series I, vols. I–VI. 1865–71; ditto, Series II. Copenhagen. 1871 f

Diplomatarium Dalecarlicum. Ed. C. G. Kroningssvard and J. Liden. 4 vols. Stockholm 1842–53.

Eliae, Paul. Danske Skrifter. Ed. C. G Secher. Copenhagen. 1855

—— Historiske Optegnelsesbog. Ed. A. Heise. 2 parts 1890–1.

—— Chronicon Skibyense. Scriptores rerum Danicarum. I. Ed. Rœrdam.

Fant, E. M. Acta et litterae ad historiam Reformationis in Suecia. Upsala. 1807.

Fryxell, A. Handlingar rorande Sveriges Historia, ur Utrikes Arkiver. 9 vols. Stockholm. 1836–43.

Gustaf I's Registratur. (Handlingar rorande Sveriges Historia.) Ed. by I. I. Nordstrom. 10 vols. Stockholm. 1861–87.

Handlingar rorande Skandinaviens Historia. Stockholm. 1816 f. *Passim.*

Hildebrand, E. Svenska Riksdagsakter. Stockholm. 1887 etc.

Historika Handlingar. Kongliga Samfundet for Utgivande af Handskrifter rorande Skandinaviens Historia. 11 vols. Stockholm. 1861–79.

Hosius, S. Opera. 2 vols. Cologne. 1584.

Kalkar, C. H. Aktstykker henhörende til Danmarks Historie i Reformationstiden. Odense. 1845.

Krag, N. and Stephanius, S. Den Konge Christian III's Historie. Edd. Suhm and Gram. 2 vols. and suppl. Copenhagen. 1776–8–9.

Kyrko-Ordningar och Förslag dertill före 1686. I. Handlingar rörande Sveriges Historia. II, ii. Stockholm. 1872.

Laurensen, P. Malmœbogen. Ed. H. F. Rœrdam. Copenhagen. 1868.

—— En stakket Undervisning. Ed. H. F. Rœrdam. Copenhagen. 1890.

Lindblom, J. A. Linköping Bibliotheks Handlingar. 2 vols. Linköping. 1793–5.

Meddelelser fra det norske Rigsarchiv. Christiania. 1870 etc.

Münter, F. Aktstykker vedkommende Kong Christian og Dronning Dorotheas Kroning af Bugenhagen. Copenhagen. 1831.

Norske Rigsregistranter. Christiania. 1861 etc.

Ordinatio ecclesiastica Regnorum Daniae. Ed. J. Bugenhagen. Copenhagen. 1537.

Palladius, Peder. Visitatsbog. Ed. A. C. L. Heiberg. Copenhagen. 1867.

Pedersen, Chr. Danske Skrifter. 5 vols. Ed. C. J. Brandt and R. T. Fenger. Copenhagen. 1850–6.

Petri, Olaus. Svenska Kronika Ed. G. E. Klemming Stockholm. 1860. [A revised version by his brother Laurentius in Scriptores rerum Suecicarum. II. Upsala. 1828]

—— Postilla. Stockholm. 1857.

Pontoppidan, E. Annales Ecclesiae Danicae. II, III. Copenhagen. 1744–7.

Regesta Diplomatica Historiae Danicae. I. Copenhagen 1847.

Rœrdam, Holgar F. Monumenta Historiae Danicae. Vols. I, II. Copenhagen. 1873–5.

Sacchinus, Juvencius and Cordara, Historiae Societatis Jesu (for Possevin's reports). Antwerp. 1620 f.

Samling af Christian den Tredies Breve til Reformateurs (in Aarsberetninger fra det K. Geheime-Archivet, I). Copenhagen. 1855

Schumacher, And. Gelehrter Manner Briefe an die Konige in Dännemark. 3 vols. Copenhagen and Leipzig. 1758–9.

Scriptores Rerum Suecicarum. Vols. I and II. Ed. E. M. Fant etc. Upsala. 1818–28. Vol. III. Ed C. Annerstedt. Upsala. 1871.

Svenska Riksdagsakter. Ed. E. Hildebrand and Oskar Alin. Stockholm. 1887 f.

Swart, P. Gustaf I's Kronika Ed. G. E. Klemming. Stockholm. 1870.

Tausen, H. Smaaskrifter. Ed. H. F. Rœrdam. Copenhagen. 1870.

Theiner, A. Schweden und seine Stellung zum heiligen Stuhl. 2 vols. Augsburg. 1838–9. Fr. transl. by J. Cohen. Paris. 1842.

Thyselius, P. E. Handlingar til Sveriges Kyrkohistoria under K. Gustaf I. Örebro. 1839–41.

Troil, U. von. Skrifter och Handlingar til Uplysning i Svenska Kyrko och Reformations Historien. 5 parts. Upsala. 1790–1.

PRINCIPAL HISTORIES.

Alin, O. Sveriges Nydaningstid 1521–1611. Stockholm. 1878.

Allen, C. F. De tre nordiske Rigers Historie 1497–1536. III, IV, V. Copenhagen. 1867–70–72.

—— Haandbog i Faderlandets Historie. Copenhagen. 1870. (French tr. by E. Beauvois, with good bibliography. 2 vols. Copenhagen. 1878.)

Anjou, L. A. Svenska Kyrkoreformationens Historia. 3 vols. Upsala. 1851. Eng. tr. by H. Mason. 1859.

Bang, A. C. Den Norske Kirkes Historie i det sextende Aarhundrede. Christiania. 1901.

Barfod, F. Danmarks Historie fra 1319 til 1670. 6 vols. Copenhagen. 1885–93.

Cornelius, C. A. Svenska Kyrkans Historia efter Reformationen. Vol. I. Upsala. 1886.

Dahlmann, F. C. Geschichte von Danemark. III. Gesch. d. europ. Staaten. Hamburg. 1843.

Danmarks Riges Historie. Vol III (1481–1588). By A. Heise. Copenhagen.

Geijer, E. G. Geschichte Schwedens. I, II. Hamburg. 1832–4. Eng. tr. by J. H. Turner. London. 1845.

Helveg, L. N. Den Danske Kirkes Historie. 5 vols. Copenhagen. 1870.

Jensen, H. N. A. Schleswig-Holsteinische Kirchengeschichte. Ed. A. L. J. Michelsen. III Kiel. 1877.

Keyser, J. R. Den Norske Kirkes Historie under Katholicismen. 2 vols Christiania. 1856–8.

Lau, G. J. T. Geschichte der Reformation in Schleswig-Holstein. Hamburg. 1867.

Münter, F. Kirchengeschichte von Dänemark und Norwegen. 3 vols. Leipzig. 1823–33.

Paludan-Müller, C. De förste Konger af den Oldenborgske Slegt. Copenhagen. 1874.

Schäfer, D. Geschichte von Danemark. IV. Gesch. d. europ. Staaten. Gotha. 1893.

Waitz, G. Schleswig-Holsteins Geschichte. 2 vols. Gottingen. 1851.

Weidling, J. Schwedische Geschichte im Zeitalter der Reformation. Gotha. 1882.

SPECIAL TREATISES.

(Many of the books in this list contain documents previously unpublished.)

Baazius, J. *sen.* Inventarium Ecclesiae Sueo-Gothorum. Linkoping. 1642.

Bang, A. C. Den Norske Kirkes Geistlighed i Reformations-aarhundredet. Christiania 1897 f

—— Dokumenter og Studier vedrœrende den lutherske Katekismus' Historie i Nordens Kirke. 2 vols. Christiania 1893–9.

Brandt, C. J. Om Lunde-Kanniken Christiern Pedersen og hans Skrifter. Copenhagen. 1882.

Butler, C. M. The Reformation in Sweden. New York. 1884.

Clauss, C. H. Christian der Dritte. Dessau. 1859.

Engelstoft, C T. Reformantes et Catholici tempore quo sacra emendata sunt in Dania concertantes. Copenhagen 1836.

—— De Confutatione Latina quae Apologiae concionatorum evang. anno 1530 traditae apposita est commentatio. Copenhagen. 1847.

Fant, E. M. De successione canonica episcoporum Sueciae Upsala. 1790.

Flaux, A. de La Suède au XVI^me^ siècle. Paris. 1861.

Gustavus Vasa, the History of. With extr. from his corr. London. 1852. [Contains a short bibliography.]

Gerdes, D. Historia Reformationis. III. Groningen and Bremen. 1749.

Gfrörer, A F. Gustav Adolph. Ed 2 Stuttgart. 1845.

Gieseler, J. C. L. Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte. III. Bonn. 1853.

Gramm, J. Dissert. de Reformatione in Dania. In Scriptorum a Societate Hafniensi editorum III. Copenhagen. 1747.

Hammerich, F. Danmark under Adelsvälden, 1523–1660. 4 vols. Copenhagen. 1854–9.

Handelmann, H. Die letzten Zeiten der hanseatischen Uebermacht in Norden. Kiel. 1853.

Hering, H. Doktor Pomeranus, Johannes Bugenhagen. Schriften des Vereins für Reformationsgeschichte. VI. 22. Halle. 1888.
Knudsen, H. Joachim Rønnow. Copenhagen. 1840.
Königsfeldt, J. P. F. De katholske Biskopper i Danmark. Historiske Aarböger. Ed. C. Molbech. III. Copenhagen. 1851.
Magni, O. Historia de gentibus septentrionalibus. Rome. 1555.
[Mason, A. J.] The Loss of the Succession in Denmark. Church Quarterly Review, XXXII. London. 1891.
Messenius, J. Scondia Illustrata. Ed. J. Peringskjold. 15 vols. Stockholm. 1700–5.
Molbech, C. Historiske Aarböger. 3 vols. Copenhagen. 1845–51.
Müller, P. E. Vita Lagonis Urne. 2 parts. Copenhagen. 1831–3.
Münter, B. Symbolae ad illustrandum Bugenhagii in Dania Commorationem. Copenhagen. 1836.
Münter, F. Den Danske Reformationshistorie. 2 vols. Copenhagen. 1802.
Nicholson, A. Apostolical Succession in the Church of Sweden. 2 parts. London. 1880–7.
Nissen, R. T. Den Nordiske Kirkes Historie. Christiania. 1875
Norlin, T. Svenska Kyrkans Historia efter Reformationen. 2 vols. Stockholm. 1864–71.
Paludan-Muller, C. Grevens Feide. 2 vols. Copenhagen. 1853–4.
—— Jens Andersen Beldenak. Odense. 1837.
Reuterdahl, H. Svenska Kyrkans Historia. 4 vols. Lund. 1838–66.
Römer, R. C. H. Specimen historico-theologicum de Gustauo I. Utrecht. 1840.
Rördam, H. F. Mester Jœrgen Jensen Sadolin. Odense. 1866.
Schmitt, L. Die Verteidigung der katholischen Kirche in Dänemark. Paderborn. 1899.
—— Der Karmeliter Paulus Heliä. Stimmen aus Maria-Laach, No. 60. Freiburg i. B. 1893.
—— Johann Tausen. Gorresgesellschaft. Bonn. 1894.
Sjögren, O. Gustaf Wasa. Stockholm. 1896 f.
Thyselius, P. E. Bidrag till Svenska Kyrkans Historia. Upsala. 1851 etc.
Vogt, K. A. T. Johannes Bugenhagen Pomeranus. Elberfeld. 1867.
Waitz, G. Lubeck unter J. Wullenwever u. d. Europ. Politik. 3 vols. Berlin. 1855.
Watson, P. B. The Swedish Revolution under Gustavus Vasa. Cambridge, Mass. 1889.
Willson, T. B. History of Church and State in Norway. London. 1903.
Yssel de Schepper, G. A. Lotgevallen van Christiern II en Isabella van Oostenrijk. Zwolle. 1870.

See also Articles etc. in
Annaler for nordisk Oldkyndighed (Copenhagen).
Colonial Church Chronicle. 1861.
Historisk Tidsskrift (Christiania).
Historisk Tidsskrift (Copenhagen).
Kirkehistoriske Samlinger *and* Nye Kirkehistoriske Samlinger. 1847 seqq.
Norske Magazin.
Skandinavisk Museum *and* Skandinaviske Litteratur-Selskabs Skrifter. Copenhagen. 1798–1832.
Theologisk Tidsskrift.
Videnskabernes Selskabs Skrifter *og* Afhandlinger (Copenhagen).
Zeitschrift für historische Theologie XI; XVII (Reformation in Sweden); XX (Reformation in Iceland).
Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte. VIII, XIII.

CHAPTER XVIII.

THE CHURCH AND REFORM.

Some of the material for the following bibliography was collected by Lord Acton, and the note on Manuscripts is in his own words.

I. MANUSCRIPTS.

The archives of the Council of Trent are dispersed in many places. At the Vatican, they occupy 151 volumes. From these, mainly, the Authentic Acts will be edited by the directors of the Historische Jahrbuch, and Sickel is preparing to publish the Correspondence between Rome and the Legates during the later period.

The Farnese papers are at Naples, the Borromeo papers in the Ambrosian Library; the Altemps papers at Sesto Calende. There are 12 volumes of Commendone at Città di Castello, and 42 volumes of Cervini, the most valuable of all, at Florence; while the letters of Cardinal Pole have to be brought together from at least eight public collections. Beyond the diplomacy of the Catholic States, the Record Office contains more than is indicated in the Calendars.

Most of Pallavicini's sources are accounted for. Part of Sarpi's are reported to have been lost in a fire; but his chief authority for the last years is preserved in the Gonzaga Archives at Mantua.

Information as to manuscript materials, the present limit, and the direction of research, is given by some of the writers mentioned; by Koellner, Theiner, Calenzio, Druffel, Sickel; by Finazzi, in the Miscellanea di Storia Italiana; Cigogna, Inscrizioni Veneziane; and Valentinelli, Regesten zur Deutschen Geschichte aus den Handschriften der Marcusbibliothek (Abhandlungen der Historischen Classe der Bayrischen Akademie, 1866).

Transcripts, made from time to time for learned men, are preserved at Paris, Naples, Venice, Bergamo, Trent, at the British Museum and the Bodleian. Among these are the letters of the papal agent, Visconti, and the diaries of the Secretary Massarelli.

II. AUTHORITIES, AND COLLECTIONS OF DOCUMENTS, MAINLY CONTEMPORARY.

Balan, P. Clementis VII Epistolae. Monumenta seculi XVI hist. illustrantia, Vol. I. Innsbruck. 1885.

Baluze, S. Miscellanea, ed. Mansi, III, IV. 4 vols. Lucca. 1764.

Bartholomaeus de Martyribus, F. Opera. II 423–456. Rome. 1735.

Beccadelli, L. Monumenti Ed. G. Morandi. 2 vols. Bologna. 1797–1804.

Braunsberger, O. B. Petri Canisii Epistolae et Acta. Vol. I. 1541–56. Freiburg i. B. 1896.

Bucholtz, F. B. von. Geschichte Ferdinand des Ersten. 9 vols. Vienna. 1838.
Calenzio, G. Documenti inediti e nuovi lavori letterarii sul Concilio di Trento. Rome. 1874.
Carayon, A. Documents inédits concernant la compagnie de Jésus. 23 vols. Poitiers. 1863–86.
Caro, Annibale. Delle Lettere del Commendatore, scritte a nome del Card. Alessandro Farnese. 3 vols. Milan. 1807.
—— Prose Inedite. Ed. G. Cugnoni. Imola. 1872
Carraciolo, A. De vita Pauli IV. Cologne. 1612.
Castelnau, M. de. Mémoires. Ed. Le Laboureur. 3 vols. Brussels. 1731.
Cerasoli, F. Alcuni documenti inediti relativi al Concilio di Trento. In Archivio Storico Italiano, serie 5, vol. VIII. pp. 289-295. Florence. 1891.
Cimber, M. L., and F Danjou. Archives Curieuses, VI. 1-170. Paris. 1835.
Coleccion de Documentos ineditos para la Historia de España, vol. IX. Madrid. 1846. (Doc. relativos al concilio de Trento.)
Commendone, J. F Lettere. In Miscellanea di Storia Italiana, VI. pp. 1-240. (Regia Deputazion di Storia Patria.) Turin. 1860.
Concilium Tridentinum. Diariorum, Actorum, Epistularum, Tractatuum Nova Collectio; edidit Societas Goerresiana. Diariorum Pars Prima. Herculis Severoli Commentarius, Angeli Masserelli Diaria I-IV. Ed. Sebastianus Merkle. Freiburg i. B. 1901.
Condé, Mémoires du Prince de. 6 vols. 1743–45. Michaud, VI.
Constitutiones Societatis Jesu. Rome. 1558
Contarini, G. Opera. Paris. 1571.
Cortese, G. Epistolarum Familiarium Liber. Venice. 1573.
Cyprianus, E. S. Tabularium Ecclesiae Romanae, saeculi XVI. Frankfort. 1731
Della Casa, Giovanni. Opere, II. 6 vols Naples. 1733.
Döllinger, J. J. von. Ungedruckte Berichte und Tagebucher zur Geschichte des Concils von Trient 2 vols. Nördlingen. 1876
—— Beiträge zur Politischen, Kirchlichen, und Culturgeschichte der sechs letzten Jahrhunderte. Vols. I, III. Ratisbon. 1862–82.
Druffel, A. von. Beiträge zur Reichsgeschichte In Briefe und Akten zur Gesch. des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts. (Bavarian Academy.) 4 vols. Munich. 1873–96.
—— & K. Brandi Monumenta Tridentina. Beiträge zur Geschichte des Concils von Trient. Vol. I. 1546–7. Munich. 1899.
Ehses, S. Eine Denkschrift aus dem Jahre 1530 uber Berufung eines allgemeinen Conzils. In Romische Quartalschrift. pp. 473–492. 1894.
Fiedler, J. Relationen Venetianischer Botschaften uber Deutschland und Oesterreich im 16ten Jahrhunderte. Fontes Rerum Austriacarum, Diplom. et Acta, XXX. Vienna. 1870.
Friedensburg, W. Nuntiaturberichte aus Deutschland. 1533–9. 4 vols. Gotha. 1892–3.
Giberti, J. M. Opera. Edd. P. and H. Ballerini. Verona. 1740.
Granvelle, Card. de. Papiers d'État. Ed. C. Weiss. III–VII. Collection des documents inédits de l'Histoire de France. 1842–9.
Gratianus, A. M. De Scriptis invita Minerva, cum adnotationibus H. Lagomarsini. 2 vols. Florence. 1745–6.
—— De Vita J. F. Commendoni Cardinalis. Libri IV. Paris. 1669.
Grisar, H. Iacobi Lainez Disputationes Tridentinae 2 vols. Innsbruck. 1886.
Historiae Societatis Jesu pars prima sive Ignatius auctore Nicolao Orlandino. Pars secunda sive Lainius. Pars tertia sive Borgia. Pars quarta sive Everardus auctore F. Sacchino. Pars quinta sive Claudius, tomus prior auctore F. Sacchino. Pars quinta, tomus posterior, ab anno Christi 1591 ad 1616 auctore J. Juvencio. Pars sexta complectens res gestas sub M. Vitelleschio, tomus prior

ab anno Christi 1616 auctore J. C. Cordara. Tomus secundus ab anno Christi 1625 ad annum 1632. Antwerp and Rome. 1620–1750.

Hosius, S. Epistolae ad Diversos. In Opera II. Cologne. 1584.

—— Epistolae. 2 vols. Vols. IV and IX. In Acta Historica. Edd. F. Hipler and V. Zakrzewski. Cracow. 1879 and 1888.

Hugo, C. L. Sacrae antiquitatis Monumenta Historica, Dogmatica, Diplomatica. I. 215-426. Étival. 1725.

Imago primi seculi Societatis Jesu a Provincia Flandro-Belgica ejusdem Societatis repraesentata. Antwerp. 1640.

Instructions et Lettres des Rois tres-chrestiens et de leurs ambassadeurs et autres Actes concernant le Concile de Trent. Paris. 1654.

Laemmer, H. Analecta Romana. Schaffhausen. 1857–67.

—— Monumenta Vaticana historiam ecclesiasticam seculi XVI illustrantia. Freiburg i. B. 1861.

Le Plat, J. Monumentorum ad Historiam Concilii Tridentini potissimum illustrandum spectantium amplissima collectio. 7 vols. Louvain. 1781-7.

L'Europe Savante, IX. 63–241. The Hague. 1719. Le Courayer's selection from Visconti's letters for 1562.

Loyola, Ignacio de. Cartas. Madrid. 1874–7.

Maffei, G. P. De vita et moribus Loyolae. Cologne, etc. 1585.

Mansi, J. D. Conciliorum Supplementum, V. Venice. 1751.

Martene, E. and Durand, U. Amplissima Collectio, VIII. 1022–1445. Paris. 1733.

Milledonne, A. Journal de Concile de Trente. Ed. A. Baschet. Paris. 1870.

Monumenta historica Societatis Jesu nunc primum edita a Patribus eiusdem Societatis. Madrid. 1894, etc.

Morone, G. Legazione. In Brieger's Zeitschrift fur Kirchengeschichte, III 654. Gotha. 1879.

Paleotto, G. Acta Concilii Tridentini, 1562–3. Ed. J. Mendham. 1842.

Paris, L. Négociations, lettres et pièces diverses relatives au règne de François II. In Collection de documents inédits sur l'histoire de France. 1841.

Pastor, L. Correspondenz Contarinis, 1541. 1880.

Planck, G. J. Anecdota ad Historiam concilii Tridentini pertinentia. Gottingen. 1791–1818.

Pogiani, J. Epistolae. Ed H. Lagomarsini, S. J. 4 vols Rome. 1762–8.

Pole, R. Epistolae, et aliorum ad ipsum. Ed. A. M. Quirini. 5 vols. Brescia. 1744–57.

Relazioni della corte di Roma. Ed. T. Gar. I, II. In E. Alberi, Relaz. degli Amb. Venet. Ser. II. Vols. III and IV. Florence. 1846 and 1857.

Ribadeneyra, P. Vida del P. Ignacio de Loyola. Madrid. 1594.

—— Vita Jac. Laynes, Alphonsi item Salmeronis. Cologne. 1604.

—— Vita Ignatii Loiolae qui religionem clericorum societatis Jesu instituit. 8vo. Antwerp. 1587.

Ribier, G Lettres et Mémoires d'Estat, II. Blois. 1666.

Ruscelli, G. Lettere di Principi. Venice. 1574.

Sadoleto, J. Epistolarum Libri Sexdecim. Lyons. 1560.

Sala, A. Documenti circa la Vita e le Gesta di San Carlo Borromeo. III. 3 vols. Milan. 1861.

Santa Croce, Cardinal P. Lettres. Ed. J. Aymon, in "Tous les synodes nationaux des églises réformées de France auxquels on a joint les mandemens roiaux et plusieurs lettres politiques sur ces matières synodales." (Cinquante lettres anecdotes écrites au Cardinal Borromeo par le Cardinal de St Croix.) The Hague. 1710.

Santa Croce, Cardinal P. Vita e Nunziature, in Miscellanea di Storia Italiana, V. pp. 477–1173. (Regia Deputazion di Storia Patria.) Turin. 1868.

Schelhorn, J. G. Amoenitates Historiae Ecclesiasticae. 2 vols. Frankfort and Leipzig. 1737 and 1738.
Serristori, A. Legazioni. Ed. Gius. Canestrini. Florence. 1853.
Sickel, Th. Analecta Juris Pontificii. 1872.
—— Das Reformations-Libell Ferdinands I, in Archiv für österreichische Geschichte, XLV. (Kaiserliche Akademie der Wissenschaften.) Vienna. 1871.
—— Die Geschäfts-ordnung des Concils von Trient. Vienna. 1871.
—— Zur Geschichte des Concils von Trient, 1559–63. Vienna. 1872.
Silva, L. A. Rebello da, and J. da Silva Mendes Seal. Corpo Diplomatico Portuguez, VI–X. (Academia das Sciencias de Lisboa.) 1862–91.
Sleidan, J. Briefwechsel. Ed. H. Baumgarten. Strassburg. 1881.
Tejada y Ramiro, Juan. Coleccion de Canones de la Iglesia Española, IV. 541–886. 5 vols. Madrid. 1849–55.
Theiner, A. Acta genuina Concilii Tridentini. 2 vols. Zagrabr. 1875.
Truchsess, O. Vier ungedruckte Gutachten des Cardinals Otto Truchsess über die Lage der kath. Kirche in Deutschland. Ed. W. E. Schwarz. Römische Quartalschrift, pp. 25–43. 1890.
—— Ein Schreiben des Cardinals Otto von Augsburg über das Koncil von Trient. Ed. Knöpfler. Historisches Jahrbuch, X. p. 555. Munich. 1889
—— Litterae a Truchsesso annis 1560 et 1561 datae ad Hosium. Ed. A. Weber. Ratisbon. 1892.
Turba, G. Venetianische Depeschen vom Kaiserhofe, II, III. Vienna. 1892–5.
Vargas, F. de, and de Malvenda, P. Lettres et Mémoires de, et de quelques Evêques d'Espagne touchant le Concile de Trente. Ed. M. Levassor. Amsterdam. 1699.
Vergerio, P. P. Briefwechsel. Edd. Kausler und Schott. Bibliotek des Literarischen Vereins. Vol. 124. Stuttgart. 1875.
Villanueva, J. L. and J. Viage Literario á las Iglesias de España, con algunas observaciones. Vol. XX (1851). 22 vols. Madrid and Valencia. 1803–52.
Villanueva, J. L. Vida Literaria. II. 409–470. 2 vols. London. 1825.
Vio, Tommaso de, Cardinal Cajetan. Opuscula Omnia. Rome. 1570.
Visconti, C. Lettres Anecdotes, 1563. Ed. J. Aymon. 2 vols. Amsterdam. 1719.
Zebrzydowski, Andreas de V. (Bishop of Cracow). Epistolae, vols. I, II. In Acta Historica res gestas Poloniae illustrantia. I. Cracow. 1878.

III. PRINCIPAL HISTORIES.

Baguenault de Puchesse, F. Histoire du Concile de Trente. 8vo. Paris. 1870.
Becchetti, F. A. Istoria degli ultimi quattro secoli della Chiesa, IX, X. 12 vols. 4to. Rome. 1795–6.
Calenzio, G. Esame Critico-letterario delle opere riguardanti la Storia del Concilio di Trento. Rome and Turin. 1869.
—— Saggio di Storia del Concilio di Trento sotto Paolo III. Rome. 1869.
Ellies Dupin, L. Hist. de l'Eglise du XVI[e] siècle. Paris. 1701–13.
Froude, J. A. Lectures on the Council of Trent. London. 1896.
Janssen, J. Geschichte des Deutschen Volkes, vols. III, IV. Freiburg i. B. 1876, etc.
Laemmer, H. Zur Kirchengeschichte des sechzehnten und siebenzehnten Jahrhunderts. Leipzig. 1863.
Leva, G. de. Storia Documentata di Carlo V, vols. IV, V. Venice. 1881, 1894.
Maurenbrecher, W. Das Concil von Trient. Raumer's Historisches Taschenbuch. Leipzig. 1886, 1888, 1890.
—— Geschichte der katholischen Reformation. Nördlingen. 1880.
Maynier, L. Études sur le Concile de Trente. Paris. 1874.

Mendham, J. Memoirs of the Council of Trent. London. 1834–46. A copy prepared for a second ed. in the Incorporated Law Society's Library.

Pallavicini, Sforza. Istoria del Concilio di Trento 1656. Ed. F. A. Zaccaria, 4 vols. Rome. 1833. With additions, but omitting controversy, 3 vols. 1846.

Philippson, M. La Contre-Révolution religieuse du XVI^e siècle. Brussels. 1884.

—— Westeuropa im Zeitalter von Philipp II, Elizabeth und Heinrich IV, I. 71–184. (Oncken, Allgemeine Geschichte, &c.) Berlin. 1882.

Prat, J. M Histoire du Concile de Trente. 3 vols. Brussels. 1854.

Ranke, L. von. Die Romischen Pabste, I. Berlin. 1834. Werke, XXXVII. Leipzig. 1878.

Raynaldus, O. Annales Ecclesiastici (ed. Mansi, XIII, XIV, XV). Lucca. 1755–6.

Salig, C. A. Vollständige Historie des Tridentischen Conciliums. 3 vols. 4to. Halle. 1741–5.

Sarpi, Paolo. Istoria del Concilio Tridentino. (Pietro Soave Polano.) London. 1619. French translation with notes by P. Le Courayer. 2 vols. London, 1736, and 3 vols London, 1751.

Ward, A. W. The Counter Reformation. Epochs of Church History. London. 1889.

Wessenberg, I. H. von. Die grossen Kirchenversammlungen. III, IV. Constance. 1840.

IV. TREATISES ON SPECIAL SUBJECTS.

Baini, G. Memorie storico-critiche della vita e delle opere di Giovanni Pierluigi da Palestrina. 2 vols. Rome. 1828.

Baumgarten, H. Geschichte Karls V. Vol. III. 3 vols. Stuttgart. 1885–92.

—— Über Sleidans Leben und Briefwechsel. Strassburg. 1878.

Bernabei, N. Vita del Cardinale Giovanni Morone vescovo di Modena, e biografie dei Cardinali Modenesi. Modena. 1885.

Braun, W. Cardinal Gasparo Contarini. 1903.

Braunsberger, O. Entstehung und erste Entwickelung der Katechismen des sel. Petrus Canisius. Freiburg i. B. 1893.

Brosch, M. Geschichte des Kirchenstaates. Gotha. 1880.

Cantù, C. Gli Eretici d' Italia, discorsi storici. Vol. II. 3 vols. Turin. 1865–67.

—— Italiani Illustri, II. 3 vols. Milan. 1879.

Carayon, A. Bibliographie Historique de la Compagnie de Jésus. Paris. 1864.

Cecchetti, B. La Republica di Venezia e la Corte di Roma nei rapporti della Religione, II. 25–66 Venice. 1874.

Cossio, A. Il Cardinale Gaetano e la Riforma. Cividale. 1902.

Crétinau-Joly, J. Histoire religieuse politique et littéraire de la Compagnie de Jésus. 6 vols. Paris and Lyons. 1845–6.

Dittrich, F. Gasparo Contarini. Braunsberg. 1883.

Druffel, A. von Ueber den Vertrag zwischen Kaiser und Papst von Juni 1541. Deutsche Zeitschr. für Gesch. III. Freiburg i. B. and Leipzig. 1889.

—— L. v. Nogarola. In Sitzungsberichte der Bayr. Akademie, Hist. Classe, 426–456. 1875.

—— Entgegnung auf Maurenbrechers Antikritik. In Historische Zeitschrift, XVIII. 128–170. Munich. 1867.

—— Die Sendung des Cardinals Sfondrato an den Hof Karls 1547–48. Abhandlungen der Hist. Classe der k. Bayer. Akad. Wiss. XX. 1893.

—— Karl V und die Römische Curie 1544–46. Vier Abhandlungen der Bayr. Akademie, Hist. Classe. 1877–91.

Duruy, G. Le Cardinal Carlo Caraffa. Paris. 1882.

Eichhorn, A. Der Ermländische Bischof und Cardinal S. Hosius. 2 vols. Königsberg. 1854–5.
Friedensburg, W. Beiträge zur Briefwechsel der katholischen Gelehrten Deutschlands im Reformationszeitalter. In Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte. 1897–1902.
Gieseler, J. C. L. Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte, III, 2, pp. 505–569. Bonn. 1853.
Gothein, E. Ignatius von Loyola und die Gegenreformation, pp. 468–520. Halle. 1895.
Guillemin, J. J. Le Cardinal de Lorraine. Paris. 1847.
Harnack, A. Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, III. 588—617. Berlin. 1890. Engl. Trans. Vol. VII, pp. 1–115. London. 1899.
Hefele, C. J. Der Cardinal Ximenes. Tübingen. 1851. Trans. London. 1860.
Hinschius, P. Kirchenrecht, III. 430–451. 1883. 8vo. Berlin. 1869, etc.
Hoffman, P. E. F. Die Jesuiten. 2 vols. Mannheim. 1871.
Huber, J. N. Der Jesuiten-Orden nach seiner Verfassung und Doctrin, Wirksamkeit und Geschichte characterisirt. Berlin. 1873.
Jenkins, R. C. Pre-Tridentine Doctrine. London. 1891.
—— The Judgment of Thomas de Vio. Canterbury. 1858.
Koellner, W. H. D. E. Symbolik, II. 7-140. Hamburg. 1844.
Laemmer, H. Die vortridentinisch-katholische Theologie des Reformationszeitalters aus den Quellen dargestellt. Berlin. 1858.
Lafuente, M. Historia general de España, vols. XII, XIII. Madrid. 1853–4.
Lavallée, J. Histoire des Inquisitions religieuses d'Italie et d'Espagne et de Portugal, depuis leur origine jusqu'à la conquête de l'Espagne. 2 vols. Paris. 1809.
Lea, H. C. A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages. 3 vols. London. 1888.
—— Chapters from the Religious History of Spain connected with the Inquisition. Philadelphia. 1890.
Limborch, P. van. Hist. Inquisitionis Amsterdam. 1692.
Llorente, J. L. Historia critica de la Inquisicion de España. 10 vols. Madrid. 1822.
Llorente, J. A. Anales de la Inquisicion de España. 2 vols. Madrid. 1812–13.
Lüber, W. Gaetano da Thiene. 1883.
Maurenbrecher, W. Karl V und die Deutschen Protestanten. Düsseldorf. 1865.
Mendham, J. The Literary Policy of the Church of Rome. London. 1830.
Moses, R Die Religionsverhandlungen in Hagenau und Worms. 1889.
Müller, H. Les Origines de la Compagnie de Jésus, Ignace et Lainez. Paris. 1898.
Neue Beiträge zur Gesch. des Conzils von Trient. Sybel's Hist. Zeitschr. 1877. Part I.
Oehler, G. F. Lehrbuch der Symbolik, pp. 88–107. Stuttgart. 1891.
Pastor, L. Die kirchlichen Reunionsbestrebungen, während der Regierung Karls V. Freiburg i. B. 1879.
Pieper, A. Die Papstlichen Legaten und Nuntien in Deutschland Frankreich und Spanien seit der Mitte des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts. I. Münster. 1897.
Raderus, M. De vita Petri Canisii de Societate Jesu, Sociorum e Germania primi. Libri tres. Munich. 1614.
Reimann, E. Zur Geschichte des Concils von Trient. In Sybel's Hist. Zeitschr. XXX, 24. Munich. 1873.
—— in Forschungen zur Deutschen Geschichte, VI, VII, VIII. Göttingen. 1866, 7, 8.
Reumont, A. von. Vittoria Colonna. Freiburg i. B. 1881.
Reusch, F. H. Der Index der Verbotenen Bücher. Bonn. 1885.
Ritschl, A. Die Christliche Lehre von der Rechtfertigung und Versöhnung. Vol. I Geschichte der Lehre. Bonn. 1889.
Sala, A. Biografia di S. Carlo Borromeo. Milan. 1858.

Sclopis, F. Le Cardinal Jean Morone, 1869. In Séances et travaux de l'Académie des sciences morales et politiques (Institut Impérial de France). Vols. 90 and 91. Paris. 1869–70.

Serry, J. H. Historia Congregationum de auxiliis gratiae. Venice. 1740.

Sickel, Th. Romische Berichte, 1895–6. In Sitzungsberichte der Phil. Hist. Classe der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften. Vienna. Vol. 133, 1895 and vol. 135, 1896; and 141, 1889 and 143, 1901 and 144, 1902.

Sommervogel, C. Bibliothèque de la Compagnie de Jésus. Brussels and Paris. 1890, etc.

Vetter, J. P. Die Religionsverhandlungen auf dem Reichstage zu Regensburg. 1899.

Watrigant, H. La Genèse des Exercices de saint Ignace de Loyola. In Études publiées par des pères de la Compagnie de Jésus. May 20, July 20, October 20. Paris. 1897.

Zur Geschichte des Concils von Trient. In Sybel's Hist. Zeitschr. 1896. No. 3.

(*See also Bibliography to Chapter XII.*)

CHAPTER XIX.

TENDENCIES OF EUROPEAN THOUGHT IN THE AGE OF THE REFORMATION.

I. ORIGINAL AUTHORITIES.

Acta et scripta Synodalia Dordracena... Erdervik. 1620. [This book was so hastily printed that the text is often confused and incorrect; certain copies were issued without any date on the title page. It is the Remonstrant version of the Synod's proceedings.]

Acta Synodi nationalis...auctoritate...foederati Belgii provinciarum... Dordrecht. 1620. [The official and authoritative documents of the Reformed Church.]

Arminius, J. Opera theologica. Leyden. 1629.

—— The Works of. Transl. by James Nichols. 2 vols. London. 1825–8. Vol. III. Transl. by William Nichols, the son. London. 1875.

Bacon, Francis. For what he calls the "philosophia pastoralis" of Telesio, see De principiis atque originibus. Gruter's ed., 1653, pp. 208 ff. Spalding's ed. 1859, vol. III, pp. 65 ff. Eng transl. vol. v, pp. 466 ff.

Bellarmine, Card. Disputationes de Controversiis Christianae Fidei adversus hujus Temporis Haereticos. Ingolstadt. 1587–1590. In Opera Omnia. Vols. I–IV. Cologne. 1617.

Boehme, Jacob. Theosophische Schriften. 9 vols. Amsterdam. 1682. Die Werke Boehmes. Ed. Schiebler. 6 vols. Leipzig. 1831–46.

Bruno, Giordano. Opere raccolte e pubblicate da Adolfo Wagner. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1830.

—— Opera Latina. 2 vols. Naples. 1879.

—— Scripta Latina (Gfrorer). Stuttgart. 1836.

Chemnitius, D. M. Examen concilii Tridentini... Geneva. 1641.

Episcopius, Simon. Opera theologica. 2 vols. Amsterdam. 1650, 1665.

Epistolae Clarorum Virorum...ad Joannem Reuchlin. 1514.

Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum. Part I, 3rd ed. 1516, with 41 epistles and 7 in the appendix.—Part II, 1517, with 62 epistles, 8 being added in an appendix to a second ed. Finally in an ed. publ. 1556 a late Ep. was added, which Bocking describes as "rustice obscena."

Erasmus, Desiderius. Opera. 8 vols. Basel. 1540. 10 vols. Leyden. 1703–6.

—— Novum Instrumentum. Basel. 1516.

Ficino, Marsilio. De Religione Christiana et Fidei Pietate. Florence. 1478.

—— Theologia Platonica de Animorum Immortalitate. Florence. 1482.

—— Opera. Paris. 1641. The edition of his Translations, Venice, 1517, also contains in the dedications and the prefaces matter which is important for his views.

Gemistos Plethon. De virtutibus. Basel. 1552.

—— De Platonicae atque Aristotelicae Philosophiae differentia. Basel. 1574.

Gomarus, Franciscus. Opera theologica omnia. Amsterdam. 1664.
Grotius, Hugo. Opera omnia theologica. 4 vols. Amsterdam. 1679.
Hutten, Ulrich von. Opera omnia. Böcking. 5 vols. With two supplementary vols. Leipzig. 1859–69.
—— Die Deutschen Schriften. Ed. J. Szamatolski. 1891.
—— Gesprache...übersetzt...von D. F. Strauss. Leipzig. 1860.
Montaigne, M. de. Essais. 1580–8.
Pico della Mirandola Pici utriusque Opera. Vol. I. Basel. 1573. Vol. II. 1601. [The two Picos are the uncle and nephew, John and John Francis.]
Pomponazzi, P. De animae immortalitate. Leyden. 1534.
—— De Incantationibus. Basel. 1556.
—— De Fato, libero Arbitrio, etc. Basel. 1567.
—— Opera. Basel. 1567.
Rabelais, François. Hippocratis et Galeni libri aliquot. Lyons. 1532.
—— Œuvres de Rabelais avec les Remarques de Le Duchat et de La Monnoye. 5 vols. Amsterdam. 1711.
—— Œuvres de Rabelais, ed. variorum...avec un commentaire historique et philologique, par Esmangart et E. Johanneau. 8 vols. 1823.
—— The whole works of..., Or the Lives, Heroic Deeds and Sayings of Gargantua and Pantagruel. Done out of French by Sir Thomas Urchard, Knight, M. Motteux and others. 2 vols. London. 1708.
Reuchlin, J. De verbo mirifico. Basel. 1494.
—— De rudimentis hebraicis. 1506. Of the three books I and II were a lexicon, III a grammar; published first at Pforzheim, later at Basel at the author's own cost. [The publisher lamented that the book had no sale.] An enlarged edition under supervision of Sebastian Munster appeared at Basel, 1537.
—— De arte predicandi. 1508.
—— De arte cabbalistica. 1516.
Servetus, M. De Trinitatis Erroribus. Libri VII. 1531.
—— Christianismi Restitutio... 1553.
Socinus, F. De Jesu Christo Servatore. 1594.
—— De sacrae scripturae Auctoritate. Assertiones theologicae de trino et uno Deo. De statu primi hominis ante lapsum. Tractatus de ecclesia. Tractatus de justificatione. These treatises were published in a volume of Opuscula, printed at Cracow, 1611.
—— Opera Omnia. In vols. I and II of Bibliotheca Fratrum Polonorum. Irenopoli [Amsterdam]. Post annum Domini 1656.
Telesio, B. De rerum natura juxta propria principia. Naples. 1586. This is the date of the completed work; books I and II were published in 1565 at Rome.
Valla, Laurentius. In latinam N.T. interpretationem ex collatione graecor. exemplarium adnotationes. (Ed. Erasmus.) 1505. [The work was dedicated to Christopher Fischer the apostolical protonotary.]
—— Declamatio de falso credita et ementita Constantini M. donatione, cum ipsa hac donatione. Written 1440. Cf. Hutteni Opera I, pp. 18 ff. English translation with Hutten's preface about 1534. French translation, with historical dissertation, 1879.
—— Elegantiarum Lat. Ling. Paris. 1471. [This work has been frequently republished: in the 15th century alone, no fewer than 12 editions appeared.]
—— De Voluptate ac Vero Bono, with its continuation or appendix "De libero Arbitrio." 1483.
—— Opera. Basel. 1540–3. [The edition however is not quite complete.]
Zanchius, H. Omnia opera theologica. 3 vols. Geneva. 1619.

II. BIOGRAPHIES OF REPRESENTATIVE THINKERS.

Adamson, R. Giordano Bruno. In The Development of Modern Philosophy, vol. II. Edinburgh. 1903.

Baird, H. M. Theodore Beza. New York. 1899.

Baum, J. W. Theodor Beza, nach handschriftlichen Quellen dargestellt. Leipzig. 1843–52.

Berti, D. Giordano Bruno, sua vita e sua dottrina. Turin. 1868. New edition, 1880.

Christie, R. C. Étienne Dolet, the Martyr of the Renaissance. London. 1880. New edition, revised and corrected, 1899.

Douen, O. Clément Marot et le Psaultier Huguenot. 2 vols. Paris. 1878–9.

Drummond, R. B. Erasmus, his Life and Character as shewn in his Correspondence and Works. 2 vols. London. 1873.

Fiorentino, F. Bernardino Telesio. 2 vols. Florence. 1872.

—— Pietro Pompanazzi. Florence. 1868.

Firth, I. Life of Giordano Bruno. London. 1887.

Geiger, L. Johann Reuchlin; sein Leben und seine Werke. Leipzig. 1871. (See also Geiger's edition of Reuchlin's Briefwechsel. Tübingen. 1875.)

Jortin, J Life of Erasmus. 2 vols. London. 1758–60.

Levi, D. Giordano Bruno, o La Religione del Pensiero. Turin. 1887.

McIntyre, J. L. Giordano Bruno. London. 1903.

Mayerhoff. Johann Reuchlin. Berlin. 1830.

Monrad, G. (Bishop of Lolland and Falster). L. Valla. Die erste Kontroverse über d. Ursprung d. apostol. Glaubensbekenntnisses. Transl. from the Danish by A. Michelsen. Gotha. 1881.

Schlosser, F C. Theodor de Beza und Peter Martyr Vermigli Heidelberg. 1809.

Strauss, D. F. Ulrich von Hutten. Bonn. 1877.

Tocco, F. Le Opere Latine di Giordano Bruno exposte e confrontate con le Italiane. Florence. 1889. See also: Le Opere Inedite di G. B. Naples. 1891.

Wolf, M von. Lorenzo Valla. Sein Leben und seine Werke. Leipzig. 1893.

III. HERESIES.

Anabaptists.

Bax, E. Belfort. Rise and fall of the Anabaptists. London. 1903.

Blaupot ten Cate, S. Geschiedenis der Doopgezinden. Leeuwarden. 1839–47.

Bouterwek, C. W. Zur Litteratur und Geschichte der Wiedertaufer. Bonn. 1864.

Burrage, H. S. The anabaptists of the 16th century. Papers of Amer. Soc. of Ch. Hist. III.

Cornelius, C. A. Geschichte des Munsterischen Aufruhrs. 2 vols. Leipzig. 1850–60.

—— Historische Arbeiten, Essays II and III. Leipzig. 1899.

Erkbam, H. W. Geschichte der protest. Sekten im Zeitalter der Reform. Hamburg. 1848.

Geschichtsbücher der Wiedertäufer in Oestreich-Ungarn. Ed. by Dr J. Beck. Vienna. 1883.

Heberle, Th. St. und Kr. 1851 pp. 121-194, 1855 pp. 817-890.

History of Anabaptists of High and Low Germany. (Anon.) 1642.

Keller, Ludwig. Geschichte der Wiedertäufer. Münster. 1880.

Loserth, J Wiedertäufer in Mähren. Archiv für Oesterr. Geschichte. Vol. 81, pp. 135 ff. Vienna. 1894.

—— Balthasar Hubmayer. Brunn. 1893.

—— Die Stadt Waldshut und die Oesterreich. Regierung 1523–6. (Archiv für Oesterr. Geschichte. Vol. 77, p. 1.) Vienna. 1891.

Menno, Simons. Werke. Amsterdam. 1681.
Ottii Annales anabapt. Basel. 1672.
Seidemann, J. C. Thomas Münzer. Dresden and Leipzig. 1842.

Socinians.

Fock, O. Der Socinianismus. Kiel. 1847.
Krasinski, Count V. Historical Sketch of the Rise, Progress and Decline of the Reformation in Poland. Engl. transl. 2 vols. London. 1838.
Rees, T. The Racovian catechism... London. 1818.
Tollin, H. Das Lehrsystem Michael Servets genetisch dargestellt. Gütersloh. 1876–78. [Tollin has most exhaustively discussed Servetus and almost every question connected with him. His articles, extending over many years, are to be found in many German historical and theological reviews and periodicals; notably in the St u Kr, the Zeitschr fur Wissensch. Theologie, and the Jahrb. für Protestant Theologie.]
Willis, R. Servetus and Calvin... London. 1877.

Miscellaneous.

Arnold, G. Kirchen und Ketzer-Historie. 4 vols. Frankfort am Main. 1699.
Cantù, C. Gli Eretici d' Italia. 3 vols. Turin. 1865–7.
Harnack, A. Dogmengeschichte. Vol. 3. Third Book. 1890. Translation by W. McGilchrist. Vol. vii. London. 1899.

IV. GENERAL.

Baur, F. C. Die christliche Lehre von der Dreieinigkeit und Menschwerdung Gottes. 3rd vol. Tubingen. 1843.
Buhle, J. G. Geschichte der neuern Philosophie. Gottingen. 1800.
Bruckerus, Jacobus. Historia critica philosophiae. 4 vols. Leipzig. 1743.
Carriere, M. Die philosophische Weltanschauung der Reformationszeit. Stuttgart. 1847.
Dollinger, J. J. von. Die Reformation... 3 vols. Regensburg. 1851.
Hegel, G. W F. Geschichte der Philosophie. 3 vols. Berlin. 1836.
Höffding, H. History of modern philosophy. Vol. i. London. 1900.
Lavallée, J. Histoire des Inquisitions Religieuses. 2 vols. Paris. 1808.
Llorente, J. A. Historia critica de la Inquisicion de España. Madrid. Translated by A. Pellier. 2nd ed. 1818. Histoire Critique de l'Inquisition d'Espagne. 4 vols. Paris. 1818.
McCrie, T. History of the Reformation in Italy. Edinburgh. 1827. New ed. 1856
Philippson, M. La Contre-Révolution Religieuse au xvi Siècle. Brussels. 1884.
Ritter, H. Geschichte der christlichen Philosophie. Hamburg. 1850.
—— Die christliche Philosophie .. Gottingen. 1859.
Schultze, F. Geschichte der Philosophie der Renaissance. Jena. 1874.
Tozer, H. F. A Byzantine Reformer. Journal of Hellenic Studies, 1886, pp. 353–380.
Zeller, E. Geschichte der deutschen Philosophie. Munich. 1875.

(See also the Bibliographies to Chapters XVI. and XVII. of Vol. I.)

CHRONOLOGICAL TABLE

OF

LEADING EVENTS.

1503 Death of Alexander VI. Accession of Julius II.
1508 Luther goes to Wittenberg.
1509 Accession of Henry VIII in England.
1511 Synod of Pisa.
1512 Opening of the Fifth Lateran Council.
1513 Death of Julius II. Accession of Giovanni de' Medici as Leo X.
— Accession of Christian II in Denmark, Norway, and Sweden.
1515 Death of Louis XII of France. Accession of Francis I.
— Battle of Marignano (September 13).
1516 French Concordat with Leo X.
— Death of Ferdinand of Aragon.
— Treaty of Noyon.
1517 Close of the Fifth Lateran Council.
— Charles V goes to Spain.
— Publication of Luther's Theses (November).
1518 Luther before the Cardinal-Legate at Augsburg.
— Zwingli, people's priest at Zurich.
1519 Death of the Emperor Maximilian (January 19).
— Election of Charles to the Empire (June).
1520 Luther excommunicated
— Publication of Luther's *Appeal to the Christian Nobility.*
— Charles V in England (May). Field of Cloth of Gold (June).
— Coronation of Charles V at Aachen (October).
— Christian crowned King of Sweden (November).
— The Stockholm Bath of Blood.
— Straits of Magellan passed.
1521 Rising of Gustaf Eriksson (Gustavus Vasa) in Dalecarlia.
— Defeat of the *Comuneros* at Villalar (April 24).
— Diet of Worms. Luther placed under the Ban of the Empire.
— Treaty of Bruges (August). Albany in Scotland.
— Outbreak of war. Occupation of Milan by the forces of Charles and Leo X (November).
— Death of Leo X (December 1).
1522 Election of Adrian Dedel as Adrian VI.
— Luther returns to Wittenberg.
— Battle of the Bicocca (April).
— Charles V in England. Treaty of Windsor (June).

1522 Charles V in Spain.
—— The Knights' War in Germany.
—— Conquest of Mexico completed.
—— Capitulation of Rhodes to the Turks (December).
1523 First public disputation at Zurich.
—— Flight of Christian II from Denmark.
—— Rule of Frederick I (of Holstein) in Denmark and Norway.
—— Gustavus Vasa King in Sweden.
—— Defection of the Constable of Bourbon.
—— Bonnivet in Italy.
—— Suffolk and van Buren in Picardy.
—— Death of Adrian VI (September 14).
—— Election of Giulio de' Medici as Clement VII.
1524 Retreat of Bonnivet.
—— Albany leaves Scotland for the last time.
—— Beginnings of the Peasants' Rising in Germany (June).
—— Invasion of France. Siege of Marseilles.
—— Francis crosses the Alps.
—— Foundation of the Theatine Order.
1525 Battle of Pavia (February 24).
—— Treaties of the Moor (August).
—— Conspiracy of Girolamo Morone.
—— Prussia becomes a secular duchy.
1526 Treaty of Madrid (January).
—— Marriage of Charles V with Isabella of Portugal.
—— League of Cognac (May).
—— Diet and Recess of Speier.
—— Battle of Mohács (August).
—— Raid of the Colonna on Rome (September).
—— Ferdinand elected King of Bohemia and of Hungary.
—— The Reformation begins in Denmark
1527 Alliance of Henry VIII and Francis I.
—— Sack of Rome (May 6).
—— Diet of Vesterås in Sweden. Vesterås Recess.
—— Invasion of Italy by Lautrec.
1528 France and England declare war on the Emperor (January).
—— Siege of Naples by Lautrec.
—— Defection of Andrea Doria.
—— Campeggio in England
1529 Diet of Speier. The "Protest."
—— Execution of Berquin.
—— Civil War in Switzerland. First Peace of Kappel.
—— Treaty of Barcelona (June 29).
—— Charles V in Italy.
—— Peace of Cambray (August 5).
—— Siege of Vienna by the Turks.
—— Conference of Marburg.
—— Fall of Wolsey.
1530 Conference at Bologna (Charles V and Clement VII).
—— Last imperial coronation by the Pope.
—— Charles V in Germany. Diet of Augsburg. Confession of Augsburg.
—— Capture of Florence (August).
—— Revolt against the Bishop at Geneva.
—— Death of Margaret of Savoy (December)

1531 Ferdinand elected King of the Romans.
—— Maria of Hungary Regent of the Netherlands.
—— Henry VIII Supreme Head of the Church in England.
—— Marriage of Catharine de' Medici with Henry of France (October).
—— Battle of Kappel and death of Zwingli (October).
—— League of Schmalkalden.
1532 Inquisition first established at Lisbon.
—— Annates abolished in England.
—— Alliance of France and England.
—— Turkish invasion repelled.
—— Religious Peace of Nürnberg (July).
—— Charles in Italy.
—— Second Conference at Bologna (December).
—— Conquest of Peru.
1533 English Act in restraint of Appeals to Rome.
—— Wulleuwever Burgomaster of Lubeck.
—— Marriage of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn (May).
—— Catholic League of Halle.
—— Address of Cop Flight of Calvin.
—— Death of Frederick I of Denmark Disputed succession.
1534 Anabaptist rising at Munster.
—— Duke Ulrich recovers Württemberg.
—— Peace of Cadan (June).
—— The *Grafenfehde*.
—— Foundation of the Society of Jesus by Ignatius Loyola.
—— Death of Clement VII (September).
—— Accession of Alessandro Farnese as Paul III.
—— The Placards at Paris.
—— English Act against Papal Dispensations, &c.
1535 English Act of Supremacy.
—— Expedition of Tunis.
—— Charles V in Sicily and Naples
—— Death of Francesco Sforza (November).
1536 First Helvetic Confession.
—— Treaty of Francis with Solyman.
—— Third War between Francis I and Charles V. Savoy occupied by the French (March).
—— Calvin at Ferrara.
—— Publication of the *Christianae Religionis Institutio.*
—— Wittenberg Concord.
—— Calvin at Geneva.
—— Invasion of Provence by Charles V.
—— Smaller monasteries dissolved in England. The Ten Articles.
—— Christian III established on the throne of Denmark and Norway.
1537 Murder of Alessandro de' Medici. Succession of Cosimo I in Florence.
—— *Consilium delectorum Cardinalium de emendanda Ecclesia.*
1538 Calvin expelled from Geneva.
—— Truce of Nice between Charles V and Francis I (June).
—— Catholic League of Nurnberg (June).
—— Death of Charles of Gelders.
1539 Revolt of Ghent.
—— William succeeds to Cleves-Jülich.
—— Joachim II of Brandenburg becomes a Protestant.
—— Death of Duke George of Saxony.

1539 Monasteries suppressed in England. Act of the Six Articles.
1540 Marriage and divorce of Anne of Cleves.
— Venice makes peace with the Turks.
— Reduction of Ghent (February).
— Investiture of Philip with Milan.
— Edict of Fontainebleau.
— Death of John Zapolya.
— The Jesuit order approved by Paul III.
1541 Religious Colloquy of Ratisbon.
— Solyman takes Buda (September).
— Expedition against Algiers (October).
— Calvin returns to Geneva.
1542 Fourth War between Charles and Francis I.
— John Frederick of Saxony and Philip of Hesse overrun Brunswick.
— Death of James V of Scotland (December).
— The Inquisition established at Rome.
1543 Barbarossa in the Western Mediterranean.
— Expedition of Charles against the Duke of Cleves.
— Conquest of Gelders.
1544 Diet of Speier.
— Battle of Ceresole (April).
— Sieges of Boulogne and St Dizier.
— Peace of Crépy (September)
1545 Massacre of the Waldenses of Provence (April).
— Opening of the Council of Trent (December).
1546 Death of Luther (February).
— Peace between France and England.
— Diet of Ratisbon.
— Alliance of Charles V with Maurice of Saxony.
— League of Charles V with Paul III.
— The Schmalkaldic War.
— Execution of the Fourteen of Meaux.
1547 Death of Henry VIII (January). Accession of Edward VI.
— Somerset Protector
— Death of Francis I (March). Accession of Henry II.
— The Council removes from Trent to Bologna (March).
— Battle of Mühlberg (April). Maurice Elector of Saxony.
— Murder of Pierluigi Farnese (September).
— Diet of Augsburg (September).
— Battle of Pinkie.
— Establishment of *La Chambre Ardente.*
— Inquisition finally established at Lisbon.
1548 Betrothal of Mary Stewart to the Dauphin Francis.
— The Augsburg *Interim* proclaimed (May).
— First Prayer-Book of Edward VI.
1549 *Consensus Tigurinus*
— War between England and France.
— Battle of Dussindale.
— Fall of Somerset. Rule of Warwick (Northumberland) in England.
— Council of Bologna suspended
— Death of Paul III.
1550 Election of Giovanni Maria del Monte as Julius III.
— Peace between England and France. Boulogne restored to France.
— Maurice of Saxony undertakes to execute the ban against Magdeburg.

1551	War in the Parmesan.
—	The Council reopened at Trent.
—	Capture of Tripoli by the Turks.
—	War in Savoy (September).
—	Capitulation of Magdeburg (November).
1552	Treaty of Chambord (January).
—	Second Act of Uniformity and Second Book of Common Prayer.
—	Invasion of Lorraine by France (March). Occupation of the three bishoprics.
—	Flight of Charles V before Maurice of Saxony (May).
—	Suspension of the Council of Trent.
—	Conference at Passau. Treaty of Passau.
—	Siege of Metz (October—December).
1553	League of Heidelberg.
—	Capture of Terouanne (June).
—	Battle of Sievershausen (July). Death of Maurice of Saxony.
—	Death of Edward VI of England (July). Lady Jane Grey proclaimed.
—	Accession of Mary Tudor.
1554	Rising of Sir Thomas Wyatt.
—	Expulsion of Albrecht Alcibiades from Germany.
—	Marriage of Philip of Spain and Mary Tudor (July).
1555	Diet of Augsburg. Religious Peace of Augsburg (September).
—	Death of Julius III (March). Giovanni Pietro Caraffa elected as Paul IV.
—	Fall of Siena (April)
—	Abdication of Charles V at Brussels.
1556	Truce of Vaucelles.
—	War between Paul IV, supported by France, and Philip II, in Italy.
—	The Duc de Guise in Italy (December).
1557	England declares war on France.
—	Battle of St Quentin (August).
—	Paul IV makes peace with Philip II (September).
1558	Capture of Calais (January)
—	Marriage of Mary Stewart and the Dauphin Francis.
—	Laynez elected General of the Jesuit Order.
—	Battle of Gravelines (July).
—	Death of Mary Tudor (November). Accession of Elizabeth.
1559	Death of Christian III of Denmark (January).
—	Acts of Supremacy and Uniformity in England.
—	Treaty of Cateau-Cambrésis (April).
—	John Knox in Scotland. The Lords of the Congregation in arms.
—	Protestant Synod at Paris.
—	Death of Henry II of France (July). Accession of Francis II.
—	Death of Paul IV (August).
—	Election of Giovanni Angelo de' Medici as Pius IV.
1560	Death of Gustavus Vasa of Sweden.
—	Tumult of Amboise (February—March).
—	Michel de l'Hôpital Chancellor of France.
—	Edict of Romorantin (May).
—	Treaty of Edinburgh (July).
—	Reforming Parliament at Edinburgh (August).
—	Arrest of Condé (October).
—	Death of Francis II of France. Accession of Charles IX.
—	French Estates at Orleans.
1561	French Estates at Pontoise.
—	Mary Stewart in Scotland (August).

1561 Colloquy of Poissy (September).
1562 The Council reopens at Trent.
—— Opening of the Religious Wars in France.
—— Treaty of Hampton Court (September).
1563 The Thirty-Nine Articles.
—— Close of the Council of Trent.
1564 Bull *Benedictus Deus.*
—— Death of Calvin (May)

INDEX.

CAMBRIDGE: PRINTED BY J. & C. F. CLAY, AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS.